



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 2011

No. 86

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
June 15, 2011.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RICH NUGENT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2011, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### IN MEMORY OF GRAHAM B. PURCELL, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the House that one of our former colleagues, the Honorable Graham P. Purcell, Jr., has passed away at the age of 92.

Graham Purcell was a larger-than-life figure who led a remarkable life of service. Whether it was as a soldier in World War II, a State judge, or a U.S. Congressman, he served with a strength of character and with a love

of country that has provided an example and an inspiration for many people, including me. A man of deep faith, Graham possessed a generosity of spirit that extended to all aspects of his life. He was a member of the Greatest Generation that saved the world from totalitarianism and then came home to build the most prosperous nation the world has ever known. But Graham Purcell was also an individual who would stand out in any generation, rising from humble roots to help make history.

He was born in Archer County, Texas, on May 5, 1919. After high school, he enrolled in Texas A&M, but the war came, and shortly after Pearl Harbor he entered the Army, serving in Tunisia and in Italy, and earning, among other awards, the Silver Star. Even after he was discharged, he continued to serve in the Army Reserves for a number of years. When he returned from the war, he finished his degree at Texas A&M and then Baylor Law School. After practicing law for a few years, he was appointed judge for the 89th district court in Texas, and served from 1955 until 1962, when he resigned in order to run for Congress in a special election.

Serving in the House from January 1962 until January 1973, Congressman Purcell focused primarily on his work on the Agriculture Committee, serving as chairman of the Livestock Subcommittee. He also played a key role in the Congressional Prayer Breakfast, and served the people of North Texas with integrity and distinction for 11 years. After Congress, Graham practiced law and helped found a large law firm and then served as a visiting district judge in Texas. But in whatever capacity—soldier, judge, Congressman, citizen—Graham was committed to serving others. He and his wife, Nancy, just recently received an award for helping children in crisis in the Wichita Falls community.

Graham Purcell led a rich, full, remarkable life. How many others can say that they shook hands with Winston Churchill while serving as a soldier in Italy; had Vice President Johnson come pick him and his family up at the airport just after he was elected in a special election to take them to the Johnson home so they could stay for a while until they had a chance to find a place of their own; or, on the last night of President Kennedy's life spent more than an hour with him on the plane from Houston to Fort Worth, swapping stories back and forth, and then was in the motorcade the next day when President Kennedy was assassinated; or, made numerous trips back and forth to Vietnam to thank our soldiers for what they were doing there, always stopping at a burn unit along the way to make sure that those severely wounded would know that their country appreciated what they were doing; or, at age 92, just a few weeks ago, offer important guidance and advice to one of his successors about the importance of putting the country first ahead of party, ahead of personal considerations.

Although Graham loved history—and he certainly loved to regale family and friends with some of his amazing stories—he was also a person who was always looking forward. He was consumed by what kind of country would be left to his children and his grandchildren. And it was this focus on the common good that dominated his life story and really defined him as a man and as a public servant. He and his wife, Nancy, have 8 surviving children as well as 25 grandchildren and 5 great grandchildren, all of whom benefited from his loving care and will miss him greatly.

Although Graham had many titles and roles in his life, he knew that first and foremost he was a child of God. It was from this perspective that he lived—and it is in this assurance that he now rests.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4189

## THE WAR ON DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. This past Friday, the United States would have observed—"celebrated"—would be entirely the wrong word—the 40th anniversary of the war on drugs. The war on drugs was initiated by President Richard Nixon. He said we can have a war on drugs 40 years ago.

The fact is, 40 years later, we've spent nearly a trillion dollars on the war on drugs. We have just as much drug use in this country as ever before. We've incarcerated millions and millions of people for victimless crimes. And when we get people who sell drugs, which we need to do, all that happens is like sharks teeth—they're replaced by the next in line; somebody else wanting to make money from a program that the public endorses and supports. So the war on drugs has been a terrible mistake.

Now, don't get the wrong impression. I'm not suggesting that drug abuse and drug addiction is not a great problem that we must deal with. But our approach in treating it as a law enforcement matter and not as a health matter, a health care issue, has led to prison populations increasing, racial disparities of the greatest source in this Nation in the arrest process, and a lost generation of people with no education and no job prospects because those arrests haunt them for the rest of their lives.

Think about how many law enforcement resources have been wasted on drug arrests—nonviolent drug arrests—when policemen could be spending their time working against violent crime and crimes that are dangerous to people—robberies and murders and assaults and other offenses that are truly important to the American public. It has been estimated that the total criminal justice cost of marijuana arrests for State and local governments is as much as \$7.6 billion a year. That averages out to about \$10,000 per arrest. Think of all the serious criminals that could have been arrested instead.

I was shocked recently to read that the New York City Police Department arrested 50,000 people for low-level marijuana offenses last year. New York City, 50,000 arrests for low-level marijuana offenses. This was more than during a 19-year period between 1978 and 1996 combined. Marijuana use has not skyrocketed in the last year, but arrests have ramped up. They use arrests as a basis to get people, particularly people of color, where it's seven times more likely you'll be arrested if you're African American and four times more likely you'll be arrested if you're Latino, and more likely if you're African American or Latino that you'll spend the night in jail than if you're Caucasian, as a way to take people and arrest them and deprive them of what should be their basic civil rights to go around the city.

Our local budgets are straining like never before. And yet we see more arrests. It's time that we question this policy, this war, knowing that insanity is repeating the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. This is insane. For 40 years we've had this war on drugs. We've had a war on our own citizens. We've wasted monies that can be used for better things. And we've treated what is a health problem and a societal problem as a law enforcement problem. It is a mistake. We need to change our approach.

Drug courts have been a successful way to deal with this problem. We have drug courts in my community that have been successful in getting people to see a different approach to life—not a jail, but a different approach. Racial disparities that I mentioned have been tremendous. It is seven times more likely if you're African American, four times more like if you're a Latino, to be arrested. These inequities run throughout our drug policy program and need to be directed. We corrected a discrepancy between powder cocaine and crack last year. It was 100-to-1 before we changed the law. It's now 18-to-1 in quantity. Still, it should be equal. And it results in racial disparities once again.

□ 1010

I have introduced legislation, the Justice Integrity Act, which would study those disparities and a Byrne Program Accountability Act which would require States to do studies on their racial disparities. The fact is law enforcement makes arrests for these crimes sometimes to justify getting Byrne funds and getting funds from the Federal Government for the purpose of getting money into their programs and not providing justice.

We need to have expungement laws so that people who have had nonviolent drug offenses can have their records expunged and go on to get employment and have a successful life in America. I have introduced the Fresh Start Act that says if you have a nonviolent Federal offense and you've spent 7 years and had a clean life, you can get your record expunged. This needs to become the law and give people a second chance. Otherwise, they can't get jobs and they resort to crime.

Medical marijuana is an issue that's come up in this country and most States that have had the opportunity to deal with it have passed it, mostly by percentages of over 60 percent. I had a good friend named Oral James Mitchell. Oral James Mitchell was a Navy SEAL and one of the strongest, toughest, best friends I ever had. When O.J. was 54, he got pancreatic cancer. Pancreatic cancer destroys a person, just whittles them away. And a guy who was 210 pounds, who could do all those things the SEALs do, the hand-to-hand and the paratroops, he used medical marijuana, and his mother said, Thank God for the marijuana. It allowed Oral to have a sense of humor and to eat. It worked.

I yield back the balance of my time and urge us to solve the war on drugs by getting out of it. It is a war. It is a crime.

## MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, over 14 years in private practice in medicine, I had the great privilege to treat many, many Medicare patients, thousands of Medicare patients. I did open heart surgery, complex open heart surgery, lung cancer surgery, in times of great need, great difficulty for these seniors who had paid many years of their payroll taxes into the Medicare program with the hope and the recognition that this program would be there for them, for their health care needs in their later years.

And I'll tell you, in the '90s, when I was in the midst, at the peak of my practice, it was not unusual, and in fact quite often patients would come into the emergency room with a very difficult situation, without a primary care physician because they had not had previous health problems. And then what would happen is we would have to do emergency heart surgery on them, and once they got through all of this and got through the hospital stay, we could not find a primary care physician to take them on, to treat their everyday problems with hypertension, high blood pressure, diabetes, gout and things of that nature.

I would get on the phone time and time again and I would call family doctors and internal medicine physicians and plead with them, Why can't you take this one more patient into your practice? And it's because the reimbursement situation for Medicare was so bad even back then in the nineties that if a physician took on too many Medicare patients, they couldn't meet their costs. That situation has gotten much worse today, in 2011.

I could tell you that I have grave concerns about the future of the Medicare program and what's going to happen. And I'm not speaking as a Member of Congress, I'm speaking as a physician, as somebody who cared for many, many patients, who valued that doctor-patient relationship. This situation whereby families who have a loved one on Medicare cannot find a primary care doctor, this is a very serious situation today and getting worse by the week.

The bottom line is Medicare is in trouble. I saw this as a doctor, and I see it now as a Member of Congress.

Just a couple of facts. Over 10,000 baby boomers are reaching retirement age every day, leaving fewer workers to support them. We have an aging population. This is putting tremendous cost pressure on this Medicare program. In fact, the Medicare program, according to the Medicare actuaries, the trust fund that provides the money for the

hospital program, is going to be out of money by 2024, and now, in fact, starting last year, more money was being paid out than taken in to support this program. The Medicare actuary predicts that without changes to the current law, something that was basically not looked at when the health care law was passed, in fact, it was assumed that these certain cuts to physicians would occur in the law. In fact, what we know is that without any changes to the law, physician reimbursements will fall from 80 percent of private rates to 57 percent of private rates in 2012.

What does that mean? That means that the situation for physician practices will get even worse, whereby they can't even meet the costs of their practice. Therefore, they're going to continue to limit their exposure to taking on new Medicare patients. That means access problems. That means Medicare patients cannot get access to physicians.

We need real solutions to this. We need fact-based solutions. We need answers to the problem and not political rhetoric. So far, that's all we've seen, largely coming from the other side and from the White House on this. In fact, we're on a path to see the bankruptcy of this Medicare program if we don't act.

Now let's take a step back and look at what happened in the health care bill. This health care bill, which passed without Republican support, cut over \$500 billion from this Medicare program to expand coverage into a new entitlement, an extension of the Medicaid program. We're digging a deeper hole for ourselves without a way to pay for this. And now the plan calls for immediate 17 percent cuts in benefits for our current seniors. Current seniors, not people who are going to go on to Medicare in the future. Seniors who depend on this important program today.

Another thing that's in this bill, and it's not well-known, is a new bureaucratic entity that was created. There were many that were created in the health care bill, but there's one that really bothers me as a physician. It's called the Independent Payment Advisory Board. Okay. It sounds kind of innocuous, but what does it do? It's a 15-person board arbitrarily chosen that will make life-and-death decisions about what things will be paid for under the Medicare program.

Now, what is the recourse in all this? This is an arbitrary decision-making body, and you cannot dispute what this body is going to do. In fact, for Congress to override it, it would take three-fifths of the Senate to override it. This is going to damage the doctor-patient relationship. It's bad for Medicare patients.

I could tell you that Republicans have an idea about how we're going to fix this. I can't get into it now, and I'll do it in a subsequent speech.

#### DEBT CEILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELCH. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members of the House, the default clock is ticking. We face a default on August 2 if we do not raise the debt ceiling. Raising the debt ceiling is always a difficult vote. It is difficult because we have to do something that's necessary but not popular.

Now, the question of the debt ceiling is about paying obligations already incurred. It's not about giving this House of Representatives permission to spend more money. But what has happened with this debt ceiling debate is that it is being used as leverage by both sides to try to get its way on a long-term budget resolution, and the reality is that this country needs both. It needs, number one, to have a long-term resolution on its fiscal situation, but, number two—this is the immediate need—it has to pay its bills.

America is a great country. It has always paid its bills, and the debt ceiling is about that and nothing more. Incidentally, those bills are ones that have been incurred by Congresses that many of us were never part of. And it's not a question of whether it's a bill that you would have supported incurring the expense for: the Iraq war, the Afghanistan war, the Medicare prescription part D, the two cuts in taxes during the Bush administration, all of which were on the credit card. I was against those, but those are obligations that we have and we must pay them.

The risk of default is enormous. Every increase in the interest rate of 1 percent will cost the American taxpayers \$160 billion. The default clock is ticking.

Now, 2 weeks ago the majority brought to the floor a clean debt ceiling bill for the purpose of defeating it, and immediately upon bringing this bill to the floor and defeating it, with unanimous Republican opposition and many Democrats voting no, Members went back to their offices and called Wall Street and said, Just kidding. We will raise the debt ceiling but we wanted to send a signal.

□ 1020

We are playing with fiscal fire here. You know, it's fine to negotiate, but negotiations cannot lead to default.

Mr. Speaker, if we in this Congress, with the Republican majority now leading the way, fail to honor the Nation's obligations by making good on our responsibility to pay our bills, the bond market will work its will and we will lose our AAA credit rating, and we will do enormous damage to this economy.

This is not about a Democrat or Republican speaking. Let me quote Chairman Bernanke and a few others who commented on the urgency of paying our bills. Chairman Bernanke just yesterday said that failure to raise the

debt ceiling would create fundamental doubts about the creditworthiness of the United States and damage the special role that the dollar and the Treasury securities have in the global market. Now, I understand the desire to use the debt limit deadline to force some necessary and difficult fiscal policy adjustments, Mr. Bernanke said, but the debt limit is the wrong tool for that important job.

A few other people commenting on this:

JPMorgan CEO Jamie Dimon: A default would be a moral disaster. It will dwarf Lehman. Every single company with treasuries, every insurance fund, every requirement that—it will start snowballing, automatic, if you don't pay your debt. There will be default by rating agencies. All short-term financing will disappear. That's Jamie Dimon of JPMorgan.

The Chamber of Commerce: Failure to raise the debt ceiling would create uncertainty and fear and threaten the credit rating of the United States.

Moody's Rating Service on downgrading America's rating: Since the risk of continuing stalemate has grown, if progress in negotiations is not evident by the middle of July, such a rating action is likely.

Fitch Rating Service: Failure to raise the debt ceiling in a timely manner would imply a crisis of governance that could imperil the U.S.'s AAA status.

So we have two problems. We have a long-term problem that requires resolution, a long-term fiscal plan, but we have an immediate problem, and that is to protect the integrity of America's reputation for paying its bills.

If we have a downgrade in our rating, it's going to affect the interest rates that we pay, and that's going to hurt folks in Republican districts. It's going to hurt folks in Democratic districts who have no power to do anything.

We must raise our debt. We must pay our bills.

#### WE NEED TO GET PEOPLE BACK TO WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last September President Obama referred to America's small businesses as the "anchors of our Main Streets." Unfortunately, economic data released on Wednesday proved that the President's actions speak louder than words. The failed policies of the Obama administration have left small businesses struggling.

According to the National Federation of Independent Businesses, confidence in small business has dropped into recessionary levels. And the reason? Small businesses will tell you that their economic uncertainty is caused by low sales, high taxes, and burdensome government regulations.

Now, I hail from the State of Illinois. Let me tell you a little story about Illinois. Illinois just went and raised its

personal income tax level and it raised its corporate tax level. So, as a result of this, just a few days ago, we saw *The Wall Street Journal* put out an editorial which basically said Illinois has raised \$300 million in revenue because of the corporate tax increase. Oh, but however, because of the businesses threatening to leave Illinois, they've already spent \$240 million in giveaways to corporations to keep them there.

This idea, this thing that we've been on over the last couple of years of tax, borrow, and spend our way to prosperity isn't working. I remember when the President's economic—well, you know what? In my own home district, unemployment exceeds 11 percent in many of the counties. People are asking me: What are you doing to create jobs? Well, I tell them this: Look, the Federal Government can do one thing. We can create an environment for job creation, but the Federal Government doesn't create jobs, and that's been the problem, because in the last 2 years we've been counting an \$800 billion stimulus as a miraculous job recovery bill.

In fact, the President promised that by this time unemployment would be 6.7 percent. How's that working out? The President's team promised that if we passed an \$800 billion stimulus bill unemployment would never exceed 8 percent. We saw it approach 10 percent, and now it's back on the rise again.

Mr. Speaker, you don't solve our jobs problem by spending more money, because we spent money, and where are the jobs? Where are the jobs? What we need to do is to understand that jobs are not created by this body, but they're created by the private sector, by the folks who get up every day and they put their minds together. They come up with an idea. They risk their capital. They risk their financial well-being, and they hire somebody in hopes that this dream that they have succeeds. In many cases, it doesn't. A lot of folks with an idea to begin a small business are not successful, but then they get up and they try again.

But if you talk to any small business owner, you talk to any manufacturer in the United States, they will tell you that the biggest impediment to job creation is government regulation and taxation.

Is there really anybody that believes—now, I understand some people can argue we have to raise taxes to get more money to government, fundamental disagreement, but I understand people can argue that. But is there anybody that truly believes that raising taxes creates jobs? Is there anybody who really believes that? And what's the number one issue we have right now.

We want to take people, the almost 10 percent, the 9.1 percent of folks in this country that desperately want to have a job, we want to take them from a tax recipient to a taxpayer because they want to be a taxpayer, too.

The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and over

and over and over and expecting different results each time. But you're going to get the same result. When this body spends money, when we spend \$800 billion on a stimulus, we've got nothing but a future of debt, doubt, and despair. Well, I believe we have a future in this country that's prosperous, that never accepts second best.

There's a lot of youth watching here today, but you have a job when you graduate from college, a country that never accepts anything less than being a world leader, and I believe we never ever accept second best. So when we talk about what to do in the future, we need to talk about the most important thing. We do have to rein in spending, but we have to get people back to work, and more and more spending isn't going to do that.

#### MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Medicare, Medicare in a fact-based universe where truth matters.

With Medicare, people's health is at stake and their financial life is at stake as well. Republicans and Democrats don't agree on much these days, but most people agree that the long-term deficits of this country are driven by ever-rising health care costs. If you solve the problem of skyrocketing health care costs, our deficit problem would largely go away. What to do is the problem.

Democrats feel we have an unbreakable compact with seniors. Democrats think basic health needs of the elderly should be guaranteed and the elderly should never be driven into bankruptcy. Republicans think there is no compact with the elderly and that bankruptcy is just natural economics.

So the Republicans have wanted to kill Medicare ever since it was passed in 1965. As recently as 1993, Speaker Gingrich said: We want it to wither on the vine. The craziest thing about the Republican plan to kill Medicare is that their plan does nothing to control costs. Despite all the Republican screaming about budgets and deficits, their plan does nothing to fix the single largest problem that threatens the whole of our economic situation in this country.

□ 1030

The Republican plan is to give seniors a coupon for about half their monthly premium and then walk away. If you can't pay the other half of the premium, too bad, no health care for you. If you can pay and it bankrupts you, too bad. Costs will continue to skyrocket.

We Democrats think that the Ryan wrecking ball is the wrong way to go. Democrats are responsible stewards of the Medicare system. Democrats want

to lower costs, improve care, and keep the elderly from going bankrupt.

Now, it's important to keep the debate on Medicare reality based. The fact is that when we passed the health care law last year, the Republicans went around wildly screaming about death panels and scaring as many voters as possible. It was all politics, and it was not true.

The fact is that the health care reform had 165 measures in it to improve Medicare. Medicare is about paying for doctors, nurses, hospitals, drugs. The health care law improved Medicare by helping doctors focus more on taking care of patients, by keeping nurses from drowning in paperwork, by making hospitals more efficient, and by getting fairer prices for drugs.

The Democrats worked with hospitals to improve the payments and, so, saved the country \$157 billion in the hospital payments. The Republican plan did nothing to save Americans money. It just shifted the cost from the government onto Grandma and her kids. The Democratic health care law saved \$136 billion by reducing payments to insurance companies. The Republican plan gave a runaway train of money to insurance companies.

The annual Medicare trustee report came out last month, and it said that the new health care law was a sizable improvement to Medicare. \$500 billion of savings and better care for more people. Those are the facts. It's what any good company would do—increase quality and lower costs.

The Democrats have a plan for Medicare, and we passed it in the Affordable Care Act last year. That's why the Republicans want to repeal it.

You've got to understand what all this repeal talk is about. They want to get rid of the improvements that we made in health care. We cut money from one place that didn't make sense and improved care for prevention, for other places for seniors. We knew what we were doing.

But the Republicans' goal has always been to end Medicare as we know it. They have been very clear from 1964 right straight through Newt Gingrich and through the Ryan plan. They don't want to have a Medicare that guarantees seniors' security. They want to give them a little coupon and say: Now go find an insurance company that will take care of you, Grandma.

Think about that.

What seniors really want is certainty. When you get old, what you worry about is: How am I going to take care of myself? And how am I going to help my kids and leave a little something to them? Am I going to have to go to my kids and say: I can't go to the doctor because I can't pay for it?

That Medicare card is their security. The Republicans want to get rid of it. We have already passed a plan to save it.

**BISHOP JOHN M. SMITH'S GOLDEN JUBILEE, 50 YEARS OF PRIESTHOOD AND EXTRAORDINARY SERVICE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate to convey my profound respect, admiration, and gratitude for Trenton Diocese Bishop Emeritus John Mortimer Smith, who celebrated his golden jubilee, an amazing 50 years as a Catholic priest, on May 22 at a mass attended by over 800 people at the St. Mary of the Assumption Cathedral in Trenton, New Jersey.

The mass, concelebrated by several bishops, including Bishop David M. O'Connell, now bishop of Trenton, and several priests, including Bishop Smith's brother Father Andrew Smith, was filled with joy and reflection, befitting acknowledgement of a great servant of God.

In his moving homily, Cardinal Theodore McCarrick noted that Bishop Smith is an "extraordinary brother and an extraordinary friend. A man filled with faith, filled with zeal—zeal for the church, zeal for the people he serves, and, in a special way as a bishop, zeal for his priests." The cardinal said we are called to "model Jesus Christ to our people and imitate Christ. Mort Smith," he continued, "has lived it well."

Cardinal McCarrick brought smiles and laughter throughout the cathedral when he said, "I'm not here to canonize Bishop Smith, although that may come," and then went on to call Bishop Smith "the world's greatest kibitzer" due to his legendary penchant for telling stories, usually long, no usually very long, and happily, usually very funny.

Once when I was about to give an address at the St. Thomas More dinner in Trenton, I turned to Bishop Smith, seated with my wife and me at a table, desperate for a joke. He gave me two, and I, courtesy of his jokes, had them rolling in the aisle. Bishop Smith's uncanny ability to infuse humor and hope-filled lightheartedness into almost all things is not only entertaining but makes presentation of the gospel to an often confused and stressed-out world more efficacious.

Bishop Smith connects amazingly well with the youth. I have witnessed it many times at schools and at the annual Catholic Men's Rally. Bishop Smith has an uncanny way of challenging everyone, especially our young people, to faithfully and courageously live the gospel. And you know, it never fails. Within a minute or two of being with Bishop Smith, you always find yourself smiling and your spirits lifted.

For the many years that I have known him, Bishop Smith not only radiates the love of Christ, but he works hard and smart. Often I don't know where he finds the time.

Ordained a priest on May 27, 1961, he has really done it all. Bishop Smith has

earned several degrees and got his doctorate from Catholic University of America in the sixties and was deployed as a pastor in the Newark Archdiocese.

Over the years, he has chaired or been the director of numerous boards, including the Institute for Continuing Theological Education, the U.S. Bishops Consultation IV, and the Archdiocesan Vocational Board. He has also served in leadership positions on the Bishops' Committee on Migration and Refugee Services and served on the board of directors for St. Vincent de Paul Seminary, Notre Dame Seminary, St. Joseph College Seminary, Catholic Relief Services, St. Francis Medical Center in Trenton, and Pontifical North American College in Rome. I would note, parenthetically, he made five humanitarian trips to Africa as part of Catholic Relief Services' mission there.

As bishop, his pastoral plan, Led by the Spirit, identified seven pastoral priorities, including dealing with charity and justice, pastoral leadership, ethnic diversity, youth and young adult ministry, faith formation, and Sunday worship. Today, all 111 parishes in the diocese of Trenton are developing action plans to implement Led by the Spirit.

Bishop Smith also created the Institute for Lay Ecclesial Ministry, which has formed and commissioned approximately 100 people to date. He also updated and expanded the strategic use of media to advance the gospel and the culture of life and created Realfaith TV, an award-winning teen talk show. And he has boosted the Trenton diocese's online outreach to the Hispanic community to protect the sanctity of human life and to reach an even wider audience with news and commentary published in the excellent diocesan newspaper, The Monitor.

Faced with declining enrollment in the diocesan schools, largely due to escalating costs, which include some 36 elementary schools and eight high schools, Bishop Smith's "Commitment to Excellence" initiative established benchmarks to make an already effective education program even better.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Marie, and I were among those offering prayers of thanks at Bishop Smith's jubilee mass. We rejoiced with his family and friends for his accomplishments that are without number. We rejoiced over his bold, consistent, and compassionate commitment to defending unborn children, their mothers, and the sanctity of life. We rejoiced and were inspired anew by his life well lived.

And, Mr. Speaker, we gave thanks that, while his extraordinary ministry has changed in "retirement," he is far from done.

**NOT AS OWNER OR TENANT: NO MILITARY BASES IN AFGHANISTAN**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, a year and a half ago, we were promised a new way forward in Afghanistan, a way that would include a significant military drawdown. The date for the redeployment to begin was July 1, 2011, just 2 weeks away. Then last year, the goalposts were removed and it was decided that, in fact, our troops would remain in Afghanistan through 2014.

□ 1040

But apparently that wasn't enough. Negotiations are now under way with the Karzai government—negotiations that are happening apparently in secret and without proper accountability and transparency—for the construction of military bases in Afghanistan. Officials are being very careful not to say that these bases would be permanent, but it's clear that our government could be hammering out the details of an agreement that would call for a U.S. military presence in Afghanistan for as far as the eye can see.

I can't understand the logic here, Mr. Speaker. Why can't we grasp the very idea that the longer we are perceived to be an occupying power, the more resentment we breed in Afghanistan? The longer we're there, the more we fuel the insurgency, the more we leave our troops vulnerable, the more we put our own national security in jeopardy. Erecting permanent bases would be the biggest favor we could do for the Taliban.

I salute my good friend and fellow Californian, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for her leadership on this issue, and I would urge my colleagues to consider my legislation that would require the President to negotiate a Status of Forces Agreement that would clearly prohibit the establishment of permanent bases.

Mr. Speaker, the outgoing Defense Secretary, Mr. Gates, says we're seeking joint bases where the United States acts as a tenant as opposed to an occupying force, but I don't believe for a minute that the Taliban appreciates the subtlety of that distinction.

As long as there are boots on the ground, and not just boots but large installations with American trappings and English language street signs and so forth, the more we embolden the very radical forces we're trying to defeat.

We're going exactly the wrong direction, Mr. Speaker. At a moment when the American people are crying out for this military occupation to end, our leaders look as if they are preparing to extend it into perpetuity. At a moment when casualties are on the rise, we're preparing for a long-term presence that will further endanger, not protect, Americans.

We can't afford permanent war. It's unsustainable. We can't afford the cost in blood, treasure, lost credibility or dwindling moral authority. It's time to bring our troops and our contractors

home and leave no military footprint behind.

#### ELDER ABUSE AWARENESS DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. BUEKLE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BUEKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the issue of elder abuse. Today is Elder Abuse Awareness Day. Hundreds of thousands of Americans each year are the victims of elder abuse. According to the National Center on Elder Abuse, this number could be as high as 1 to 2 million Americans.

Elder abuse, Mr. Speaker, is a broad term for the victimization of seniors 65 years and older. There is no one picture of what elder abuse looks like. It can be physical abuse, neglect, sexual abuse, emotional abuse or exploitation.

The perpetration of elder abuse also varies—spouses, partners, caregivers in nursing homes, even neighbors. Our older elder Americans are especially vulnerable to abuse, particularly those who suffer from dementia or other mental diseases.

I find it unconscionable that the very people who fought for us in World War II and Korea, who nurtured us, who taught us, who built this society around us, would be victimized in the twilight of their lives. Our elderly citizens have given us so much, and they deserve our appreciation, our respect, and most importantly, our protection, not just for what they've contributed, Mr. Speaker, but for the ways they still enrich our society and enrich us as a people.

This August my mother, Mr. Speaker, will turn 90 years old. Three years ago, when my father died, she was lost. She was particularly vulnerable. Fortunately for my mother, she has children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren to help her and to support her. But how many other Americans, elderly folks are out there who don't have that support system, Mr. Speaker?

This is not a Democratic or a Republican issue. This is an American issue. Our seniors, our elderly, deserve our help. They deserve our protection. Please, as Americans, today is Elder Abuse Awareness Day. Let us be particularly aware of our most vulnerable, our elderly citizens.

#### AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of farmers and producers all across these United States, and especially in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. As we debate and discuss issues surrounding the Agriculture appropriations bill, let us remain mindful of the enormous impact that the agriculture sector has had on the United States and our world economy.

Agriculture employs more than 21 million American workers and accounts for 15 percent of the total U.S. workforce. In fact, in my home State of Alabama, agriculture contributes nearly \$5 billion to the State's economic sector every year. Any Agriculture appropriations bill must take into account the potential economic impact and the strengthening of the agriculture sector that is needed for the 21st century.

I understand that we are making very difficult budgetary decisions; however, I am concerned that the types of cuts proposed in this year's Agriculture appropriations bill are ill-advised and disproportionate. This bill reduces the funding for agriculture research programs, including the Agriculture Research Service and the National Institute for Food and Agriculture, by over \$354 million from last year's level.

Now, I know that that's a substantial cut in very important research that must be done, both nationally and within our individual States. In fact, the National Institute for Food and Agriculture fulfills this mission by supporting research education and extension programs at land grant universities like those in Alabama like Auburn, Tuskegee, Alabama A&M University and others. We must preserve funding for each of these critical and important investments in the future of agriculture research and food safety.

Under this Republican appropriations bill, food and nutrition programs like SNAP and child nutrition are funded at nearly \$2 billion less than the President's budget. SNAP is an important and essential program in these challenging times for low-income individuals who cannot afford to purchase food for themselves and their families. Since the program was created, SNAP has literally saved millions of lives, and currently provides essential support to over 165,000 individuals in my district alone.

The proposed funding for the Women, Infants and Children Food Assistance program, WIC as it's known, is far below what is needed to serve all those individuals who are eligible for benefits. WIC provides essential nutrition to new mothers, babies and small children under 5 that are nutritionally at risk.

Nearly 50 percent of the babies born in our country each year rely on WIC. In Alabama, WIC provides assistance to over 140,000 individuals and over 25,000 just in my district alone.

Contrary to popular belief, this program is cost-efficient, and it serves nearly 10 million people each year, costing less than \$100 per person receiving benefit. The lack of proper funding in this appropriations bill is yet another example of Republican attacks on hardworking families and children that definitely need assistance for nutrition. I cannot stand idly by and let this occur.

We must ensure that any appropriations bill provides robust and adequate

funding for these essential programs, both now and in the future. The Republican Agriculture appropriations bill reduces funding for essential rural development programs by \$337 million below last year's levels. These reductions disproportionately impact loan authority for 502 direct housing programs.

□ 1050

Without these loans, low-income rural families could not find financing options that would help them purchase homes and simply be able to live.

This bill also seeks to reduce funding for agriculture business and rural business grants by \$20 million below last year's level. In a time of economic recovery, we must continue to make strategic investments in small and rural businesses, and not make reductions.

It is important that we who know better do better. Agriculture in our global society is of the utmost importance. As our global population increases, food security and adequate food production will be necessary for our national security, economic development, and our overall survival. It is my hope that all on both sides of the aisle will pass an agriculture approps bill that is both fiscally responsible, forward-thinking, and makes economic sense.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES AND AMERICAN JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about natural resources and whether or not they can create American jobs. The answer is yes; with oil production alone, 1.2 million jobs between the three bills that Republicans passed out of committee and off of the House floor; a total of 2 million jobs if you add in the American Energy Independence and Price Reduction Act; 2 million American jobs. Not only could we be energy independent in our great Nation, but we can put Americans back to work with 2 million jobs alone in this area.

We need to have States' rights, allowing States to explore oil exploration or natural gas or utilize all of their natural resources, whether you're in Alaska and you want to drill in ANWR, or you're the Governor of California and you want to pass Tranquillon Ridge and clean up the old oil wells off of the coast. States should have those rights to be able to do that and to be able to put their own people back to work in those States.

The President's policies on our natural resources are just flawed. My friends across the aisle continue to talk about the bills that come off of this floor, whether they create jobs or not. This is indisputable, 2 million jobs. You don't have to like these jobs, but nevertheless, they are American

jobs and it gives us our energy independence.

The President has said we have 2 percent of the world's oil, but we utilize 25 percent of the world's oil with our vehicles. Now I agree, we use 25 percent; we've got a lot of cars on the roads, we have a lot of goods movement, but 2 percent? The number is flawed again. As we went through the Natural Resources Committee, we have over 65 percent of the world's natural resources between natural gas, oil, and oil shale, we just have to be willing to go get it. So rather than going to Brazil, rather than going to the Middle East and putting our troops at risk, we ought to be self-sufficient and utilize our own natural resources and put Americans back to work in the process.

Now in my district, we've got natural resource issues as well. We've seen timber issues across the Nation. In Arizona, we've seen catastrophic disasters with national forests. In my district we've got national or natural forests as well. These national forests we've got to manage better. We've got to be able to take the fuel off of the forest floor. We've got to be able to harvest some of the timber. We'll never catch up at this point because our timber harvesting plants are so far behind. But nevertheless, we've got to put Americans back to work, we've got to put Californians back to work dealing with our timber industry.

And in the Central Valley, where we have the largest abundance of ag production, all of the fresh fruits, the nuts, packaged salads, we have so many different things that California produces and yet we see some of the highest unemployment in the Nation. As our national unemployment continues to escalate, we're at 9.1 percent now, we're double that in the Central Valley, and it's a direct correlation to the water. One of our natural resources, when you shut off the water to the valley and only give it 10 percent of the contracted allocation, you have 36 percent unemployment. And in some cities it's even higher. When you go to the food lines and you see Americans—44 percent unemployment in some cities—it seems un-American to not utilize our natural resources.

So we have the ability in this great Nation. We have the bills that we're passing off of this floor. What we need to do is have the will to move them through both Houses and encourage the President to have American jobs—not Republican jobs, these aren't Republican jobs, not Democratic jobs, but American jobs; putting people back to work; avoiding the natural disasters that happen with forest fires and the natural disasters we have with flooding when we don't manage our water; creating clean energy in the process. But the most important issue, when you've got 9.1 percent unemployment and escalating across the Nation, when you've got double that in the Central Valley and continuing to escalate but you have the natural resources and the

ability to solve your own problems but ignore the fact and don't do so, we have an American problem with jobs.

As Republicans, we are willing to fix that problem. We will continue to pass these natural resources bills, but at some point we would ask our friends across the aisle to work with us. We will not solve California's energy problems or the Nation's job issue without addressing our natural resources.

#### REPUBLICAN AGENDA LACKS COMMON SENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman who preceded me in the well talked about unemployment and creating jobs. I may not have agreed with his particular nostrums, but at least that's one Republican who's talking about creating jobs.

Unfortunately, the Republican majority, in the last 6 months of leadership in the House, has brought forward no bills to put Americans back to work except they say do more of the same. What? Yes, more of the same.

The last decade, George Bush dramatically cut taxes—twice—decreased regulations under the theory that that would create jobs. Unfortunately, the facts are in. We had the worst job creation post World War II in the last decade under George Bush and doubled the deficit and debt while doing it. It didn't create jobs. Trickle down economics doesn't work. It didn't work in the Reagan era. It didn't work then. Compare that to the Clinton era. We raised taxes, yes, particularly on rich people and big corporations. We actually balanced the budget, we paid down debt, we had 3.8 percent unemployment, and real incomes went up for the middle class. I'd love to go back to those "bad old days," but no, it's the Bush policies that will work, we've just got to do more of them. Reduce spending even more.

Government can't do anything to create jobs, they say. Well, what about investing in the Nation's infrastructure? Who built the national highway system? Who built the bridges? Who built the transit systems in this country? Who helped build the rail systems? Who has maintained our ports and waterways? The Federal Government—sometimes in partnership with States or local government or the private sector. But those investments pay off.

And what do the Republicans want to do? In the face of 150,000 bridges on the national highway system that are about to—or in the not-too-distant future—have the same fate as the bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota that is collapsed, they need either total replacement or repair 150,000 bridges; 40 percent of the pavement on the national highway system; \$60 billion backlog on our transit systems.

They want to cut Federal investment in transit. And they say if we give that

money to rich people and to the corporations—who are sitting on \$2 trillion worth of cash—they'll take care of the problem. Oh, really? What are you going to do, toll 150,000 bridges across the country in order to induce the private sector to come in and rebuild them? Are you going to toll the existing interstate in order to bring it up to a decent system of good repair?

And transit systems, they all lose money. Now some on the Republican side say, well, we should just do away with transit systems, we don't need those things. Come on, let's have a little bit of common sense here. You want to talk about saving fuel? Invest in transit. You want to talk about creating jobs? Invest in infrastructure. We have the strongest Buy American requirements in transportation and infrastructure as any program of the Federal Government. We create more jobs per billion dollars than anything else. Way more than the Defense Department—where they want to shower all their funds—can be created in transportation. You can put Americans to work; not only construction workers who have horrible unemployment, not only steel workers for the bridges, not only people who maintain these systems, but engineers, software engineers, people who make tires, people who make rail cars, people who make streetcars.

□ 1100

We are making street cars in America for the first time in 70 years in Oregon due to one of those horrible earmarks they want to ban. We were buying them overseas. Now we are making them in America. Is that bad? They seem to think it is, and they want to decrease investment in these sorts of things that are proven job generators.

Now, I have to give the Obama administration a big fat D-minus on this same issue. The so-called stimulus, which they rightly criticize, which I voted against, \$800 million, 40 percent of it was Bush tax cuts, which didn't work for Bush and didn't work for Obama. Now all the Obama administration is talking about is more tax cuts. Extending the payroll tax holiday on Social Security, that will put America back to work.

Give me a break. These things haven't worked. We need real investment. If you borrow money to build a bridge that lasts 100 years, at least you can look your kids and grandkids straight in the eye when they say, what did you do with all that money, because I am still paying the bills 30 years from now. And you can say, we built that bridge you drove over to go to work. We rebuilt that transit system that you took to work today. We made America more competitive in the international economy with those investments.

You have got to start distinguishing between investments and wasteful spending. If you want to talk about cut-and-spend, then let's talk about it.



Subsidies to people to not grow things, \$5 billion a year; another \$15 billion a year in agriculture subsidies to grow surplus crops? Don't want to touch that one. Tax loopholes, giveaways to the oil companies, let's cut that. No, we can't cut the tax subsidies to the oil companies.

You know, common guys, let's get real here. Let's invest in America, in the American people, and put people back to work. We need a real program, and you people have offered us nothing.

#### DEMOCRATS HAVE WRITTEN THE WRONG PRESCRIPTION FOR MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today not just as a Congressman, but as a physician with nearly 30 years of experience treating and interacting with patients. Wearing both of these hats has allowed me to understand our health care system at each end of the spectrum, and it allows me to say with absolute certitude that the Democrats and President Obama have written the wrong prescription for Medicare. With 47 million Americans relying on our Medicare system and millions more to enter soon, it is absolutely irresponsible not to inform the public accurately of the facts about its current path if left unchanged.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, when the President's health care bill was signed into law, it ended Medicare as we know it. According to the nonpartisan Medicare Actuary, Medicare will run out of money in 2024. That is what, 13 years from now. The Congressional Budget Office says it will be as soon as 2020, 9 years from now.

House Republicans have chosen to face the facts and responsibly proposed a comprehensive plan for Medicare. The Republican budget saves Medicare by maintaining benefits as they are for those 55 years and older, while also strengthening it by bringing true choice and competition to maintain and save Medicare for our children and for our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats' plan for Medicare reform is included in the 2,400 pages of, you guessed it, ObamaCare, which is bad for American seniors and bad for the country. Their plan empowers a panel of unelected bureaucrats to ration senior health care. This panel will focus its cuts on the chronically ill and the disabled, these Medicare recipients who need care the most because they use the most health care services.

Health care rationing has never, Mr. Speaker, has never been the American way, but it certainly appears to be the Democrats' way. As a doctor, I know that the last thing patients need are bureaucrats who are unanswerable to the public, indeed, even to the Congress, making health choices for them.

The Democrats' plan also allows for a \$500 billion raid on Medicare to fund

programs in ObamaCare, a fact that they have conveniently ignored while they are consistently criticizing Republicans for so-called "cutting" care. The plan put forth by President Obama and the Democrats is a plan that cuts Medicare for seniors today, and it leaves Medicare bankrupt for our future generations, our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, my diagnosis is that American seniors should be worried only if we sit back and do nothing about Medicare or accept the Democrats' plan to gut it from sick and disabled seniors. We cannot allow it to continue on its current path to insolvency, as the Democrats and President Obama would have it. We need to support Medicare reform now so that we will have Medicare tomorrow, and that includes eliminating this rationing board as soon as possible.

#### OPPOSE THE SECURE COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CHU. I rise today in strong opposition to the Secure Communities program. I am for the stated goals of the Secured Communities program. Anyone who is undocumented in this country and who has been convicted of a serious violent offense should be removed from this country, period. But I can't support the program because of the significant evidence that Secure Communities is failing to achieve its goal.

When you look at the numbers, nearly half of the undocumented individuals from my home county of Los Angeles who have been taken into custody through this program have not committed or been convicted of a serious violent offense, and that is a problem.

Take the story of Isaura Garcia, a 20-year-old who suffered three turbulent years of abuse and beatings at the hands of her boyfriend. In February, she finally found the courage to call 911 for help. Earlier that day, her boyfriend, Ricardo, had thrown Isaura and their 1-year-old daughter out of their apartment. When she came back to the house to get her things, Ricardo showed up and it began again. He started throwing things at her, and when she tried to protect herself and her child she accidentally scratched his neck.

After the 911 call, the police showed up and put her boyfriend in cuffs, but after they saw the scratches, they took them off of him and put them on Isaura. Shocked at what was happening, she fainted. At the hospital, doctors found bruises covering her body from the weeks and years of abuse. Despite being identified by a doctor as a victim of domestic violence, she had been arrested as the abuser.

After the arrest, Isaura landed in the L.A. County jail, which was participating in the Secure Communities pro-

gram. Because of this program, she was fingerprinted and found to be here in an undocumented way. It was too late. Before she knew it, she was sent to an immigration detention center in Santa Ana.

It is stories like Isaura's that are causing the DHS inspector general to investigate the Secure Communities program. Washington State, Pennsylvania, and Washington, D.C., refused to join Secure Communities. New York, Illinois, and Massachusetts are suspending their participation in this program, and California is discussing this as well.

But that is only a first step. The concerns about Secure Communities must be properly and permanently addressed. This is first and foremost about public safety. The people on the front lines of this program, our police officers, have expressed serious concerns about its implementation. LAPD Chief Beck has noted that the program is causing a breach of trust between the LAPD and our immigrant communities, hindering our officers' duties to protect and serve all of our residents. And the numerous reports of domestic violence victims being detained through this program are simply unacceptable. If a program is causing a victim of violence to fear reaching out for help, then that program is causing more harm than good.

Secure Communities has undermined our police departments' mission of protecting the public, it has weakened protections against racial profiling, and it will have a chilling effect on immigrants' willingness to report crimes or provide useful information to the police.

We must take a long, hard look at the negative effects of Secure Communities. We must allow States to opt out of the program. We must protect the safety and welfare of all our residents and truly ensure that we will have safer, more secure communities.

□ 1110

#### SAVING MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, Bloomberg News released an analysis, district by district around America, of the highest concentration of 45- to 54-year-olds. The reason they did this analysis was to see and focus on where the impact of the Republican Medicare plan would land the hardest. In the top 10 districts which they identified, the headline of this article, which obviously is Bloomberg News, a nonpartisan news service, was: Medicare Cuts Would Hit Republican Lawmakers. Nine out of the top 10 districts in America with that highest 45 to 54 concentration are Republican districts. The 10th is the Second Congressional District, which I



have the honor of representing in eastern Connecticut.

Now, some may ask why was Bloomberg looking at the population of 45- to 54-year-olds? Well, the Ryan Medicare plan radically alters the Medicare program, starting in 2022, for people who today are 54 years old or younger. Starting with that age group, Medicare will no longer be a guaranteed benefit, but instead will be a voucher plan where Americans will be given an \$8,000 payment and told, Good luck. Go out and buy insurance.

The Congressional Budget Office has already analyzed what that means to someone aged 54 today in terms of out-of-pocket costs. In fact, it would double the out-of-pocket costs for those 54 and below, in year one, who enroll in the Medicare program. Over time, we have an analysis which shows what the true out-of-pocket costs would be for 55-year-olds with a normal American life expectancy. It would raise their out-of-pocket costs—these are additional costs—by \$182,000.

So for anybody who is out there today who is in that age group, you'd better start saving up because you're going to need a lot more retirement assets just to keep level with what an American who turns 65 today gets under the Medicare program.

We have heard a lot from just, again, one of the speakers a few minutes before, who was just making comments about Medicare's going broke and that people 65 and up are going to be protected in terms of their Medicare. Wrong. The Ryan Republican plan would immediately cancel new benefits for seniors today, that they have started to enjoy, starting in January: annual checkups, cancer screenings, smoking cessation.

I had a town hall back in Norwich, Connecticut, just a couple of days ago where I had a young primary care doctor who was talking about the fact that the new annual check-up has allowed her that extra time to spend with patients, and she has detected three cancers because of the fact that she now has the tools to do her job smartly and efficiently.

The Ryan Republican plan would cancel that annual check-up coverage, which the Affordable Care Act kicked in in January, along with cancer screenings and along with smoking cessation—all smart, preventative, wellness-oriented care which will save the Medicare program money, again, for people 55 and younger. This chart shows how the out-of-pocket costs grow exponentially.

I see some young folks up in the audience there. If you're 15 years old, your out-of-pocket costs are going to be \$711,000 higher than a 65-year-old's today who is entering the Medicare program.

What this Ryan plan really amounts to is just simply a cost shift to patients and families. It does nothing to make a more efficient health care system, and that is not a solution to the problem.

We also heard that Medicare is going broke, that it is going to be bankrupt in 2024. If you read the trustees' report, you will see, in fact, that it is a totally misleading comment. What the trustees reported was that there are sufficient funds in the program to cover 90 percent of the costs of Medicare and, starting in 2024, for at least another decade and a half. Now, that shortfall is a problem. We should not have a 10 percent shortfall starting in 2024, but that is a manageable problem. We can make smart, intelligent changes to the Medicare program just like we have done going back to 1965 when it was first enacted.

Again, we have had, in fact, solvency reports and warnings from the trustees that were much more dire in the '70s, in the '80s, in the '90s than the report that we saw 3 weeks ago. There is no reason to scare people and panic people into butchering the Medicare's guaranteed benefit in the name of fiscal solvency for the Medicare program. We can make smart choices. We can make smart changes, but shifting the costs to people 55 and younger is not a solution to the Medicare program. It ends Medicare.

Now, within families with some who are over 55 and some who are under 55, this will create two-tiered coverage. I can report to you of the Courtney Family. I'm 58 years old, so purportedly, I would get the old-fashioned benefit under the Ryan plan, but my wife, Audrey, who is a nurse practitioner—she is 51—will get the loser benefit. She is going to have to start dishing out close to \$200,000 in additional costs for her retirement under this plan.

So you've got two-tiered coverage even within families under the proposal that we have with the Ryan plan. We can do better as a great Nation to guarantee coverage—with a reasonable package that is smart and efficient to solve the Medicare program. We don't need the Ryan plan, which will shift costs to patients and families in an unfair fashion.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not refer to occupants of the gallery.

#### STOP MILITARY RAPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again draw our attention to the epidemic of rape and sexual assault in the military.

But, first, I want to mention the disturbing Government Accountability Office report released last week which showed that patients and staff have been raped and sexually assaulted in the VA. There were 284 reports of sexual assault which occurred between January 2007 and July 2010. There were

67 classified as rape, 185 as inappropriate touching, 13 as forced oral sex, eight as forceful medical examinations, and 11 as "other."

While this is not as widespread as rape and sexual assault in the military, it is yet another example where government has lacked in protecting the men and women in uniform who serve our Nation. One assault is one too many. VA facilities should be a place for aid and comfort, not for abuse.

The House Veterans Affairs' Committee held a hearing on this issue just Monday. Congress must make it a priority to hold the VA accountable and ensure that this does not happen again. As I said during my last speech on this issue, I have set up an email account so survivors of rape and sexual assault in the military can tell their stories. The address is: stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov.

Today, I want to share the story of Private Jessica Kenyon. Mr. Speaker, I must warn my colleagues that some of the language is raw. Private Kenyon served in the Army from August 2005 until August 2006. Her allegation is as follows:

During training at Fort Eustis, Private Kenyon's teaching sergeant began to harass her. He constantly touched her, and made sexual jokes and comments to her. She did not believe it would be effective to report the teaching sergeant, because her unit commander was openly misogynistic. He was known to say, "This unit never had any problems until females came into it."

In December 2005, while Private Kenyon was home for the holidays, she was raped by a member of the Army National Guard. At that point, she reported both the sexual harassment by the drill instructor and the rape to an Army sexual assault response coordinator. The Army official advised her to put the rape "on the back burner" and focus on the sexual harassment. Private Kenyon then discussed the rape with Command, who advised that it would be used against her in promotional reviews if she chose to pursue prosecution.

After she reported the harassment and rape, she was ostracized and retaliated against by her fellow soldiers. This retaliation followed her to her next assignment at Camp Humphreys in Korea. When she arrived, the sergeant advised that he had received calls warning him about her. He then made a unit-wide announcement, cautioning everyone that they "should be careful who you talk to because they might report you." The sergeant and others engaged in the ongoing sexual harassment of Private Kenyon.

In the spring of 2006, one soldier—a specialist and squad leader—sexually assaulted Private Kenyon. He put his hand under her shirt and on her breasts, and tried to make her touch his penis. She fought him off.

Private Kenyon reported the assault to Command. The assailant denied the

sexual assault, and failed a lie detector test as a result. He then recanted his testimony and admitted to the harassment. He was charged with "lying on a sworn statement," and was given only a nonjudicial punishment. He was demoted two ranks, but remained on active duty. The assailant got to keep his job. Private Kenyon got Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder.

For 16 years, Congress has been talking about this issue, and there have been 18 hearings and reports. Yet the Department of Defense still testifies that there are 19,000 rapes that occur in the military every year, and we have done nothing about it.

I urge survivors to tell their stories by writing to [stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov](mailto:stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov).

□ 1120

#### WORKING TOGETHER TO GROW OUR ECONOMY AND CREATE JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The recent release of the May unemployment rate at 9.1 percent was a harsh reminder that a jobless recovery is not a recovery at all. I believe that in order for our economy to grow and small businesses to create jobs, the first step must be to restore fiscal order to the Federal Government. This year, our government is borrowing 42 cents of every dollar that it spends. In addition to burdening our children and grandchildren with an enormous debt, such reckless spending crowds out private investment and competes with small business for access to capital. While reducing our deficit spending is an important first step to economic recovery, we can and we must do more.

Since taking office, President Obama has dramatically increased the regulatory burden on small businesses. In 2010 alone, the administration has handed down 43 major new regulations—the highest single-year increase on record. The President has also used the regulatory process to block development of vast domestic energy sources. This has led to costly burdens that prevent small business growth as well as higher prices at the pump.

While regulations can help protect our environment, they should be based on common sense and not stifle growth. Recently, I helped a small manufacturer cut through months of costly Federal red tape that delayed expansion and hiring at his facility in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. We must work to make sure that unnecessary and duplicative regulations do not stand in the way of job creation in our region and across our great Nation.

Finally, we must proactively encourage private sector job creation. I have been working, Mr. Speaker, on two pieces of legislation in this area. The Hire Just One Act would provide a one-

time tax credit to small businesses that hire a full-time permanent employee this year. I have also introduced the Fairness to Veterans Act, which would extend Federal contracting preferences to veteran-owned small businesses. This bill is designed to honor the service of our Nation's men and women in uniform as well as address the staggering 21 percent unemployment rate among veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan.

I'm committed to working to fix our economy and making sure that the Federal Government is a partner in job creation, not an obstacle to it. Together, we can grow our economy and create private sector jobs and opportunity.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Phil Hoskins, Higher Ground Baptist Church, Kingsport, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we thank You for the gifts of life and freedom. Thank You for the blessing of citizenship in the United States of America.

Today, I pray for our President and Members of the House and Senate. Lord, grant wisdom to our governing officials as they lead us during these challenging times throughout the world. Many have forgotten You and many also have forsaken You, but today we turn to You and acknowledge that You and You alone are the source of our strength and security.

Have mercy upon us, I pray. Now I claim the promise in Your word, as written in the second book of Chronicles, chapter 7, verse 14: "If My people who are called by My name will humble themselves and pray and seek My face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land."

In Jesus' name, amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### WELCOMING REVEREND DR. PHIL HOSKINS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today our guest chaplain is Dr. Phil Hoskins, a native east Tennessean.

Dr. Hoskins attended East Tennessee State University, Milligan College, and Andersonville Baptist Seminary, where he earned his Doctor of Theology degree. For 12 years, Dr. Hoskins served as a full-time Southern Baptist evangelist and has conducted over 400 revivals and crusades in 28 States and Canada.

Dr. Hoskins is now the pastor of Higher Ground Baptist Church in Kingsport, Tennessee. Since accepting the pastorate of Higher Ground in 1991, he has helped his congregation grow from under 200 to well over 3,000 members.

Dr. Hoskins is here today with his wife, Brenda, and his two beautiful daughters, McKenzie Paige and Madison Jade.

It is a great honor to introduce Dr. Hoskins, whose dedication and commitment to serving God and his fellow man is unwavering.

I would like to yield to my friend from North Carolina, HEATH SHULER.

Mr. SHULER. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

It is, indeed, an honor that you have asked one of my dear friends, Phil Hoskins, to be able to come and preside over the House this morning and lead us in prayer, a gentleman who baptized my wife, who administered the ceremony that married my brother and his wife.

So, Phil has meant absolutely everything to me and my family, and I love him unconditionally. He has been a man of great character, someone I can lean on, and I am jealous that you have him in your district.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of New Hampshire). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### IRAQ WAR COSTS—WHO SHOULD PAY?

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while in Iraq last week with Members of Congress, we not only met with our troops, but we met with Prime Minister Maliki. During our conversation, it was suggested to Mr. Maliki that Iraq eventually assume some of the costs for this war of liberation.

The war has cost billions of dollars and thousands of American lives. Since we are rebuilding Iraq and have given them a free democracy, it seems only right that Iraq at least consider paying for part of the cost with future oil revenues. I was surprised that Prime Minister Maliki reacted with an emphatic "no way" to sharing the cost. Even Kuwait helped reimburse the coalition nations when Saddam was driven from their lands. But not Iraq. They will not hear of it.

Later this same day, we learned that the Prime Minister had actually ordered the Members of Congress out of Iraq. Looks like our questions to him were a political IED.

But as the date for our military looms ever closer for departure, there are reports the Prime Minister wants our military to stay a little longer and Americans to pay for it. Iraq should help pay for the nation that Americans rebuilt and liberated.

And that's just the way it is.

#### PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLARS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Presidential Scholars Dylan Neel of Moses Brown High School and Sol Taubin of the Wheeler School for the academic excellence.

Dylan and Sol have shown themselves to be some of our Nation's most distinguished graduating high school seniors. They are two of only 141 students selected as U.S. Presidential Scholars from more than 3,000 applicants. The U.S. Presidential Scholars program recognizes graduating high school seniors for academic excellence, artistic accomplishments, and civic contributions. These young people represent the great hope of our Nation's youth and the promise of the American education system.

I also want to recognize Jennifer Stewart and Christine Barry, who were selected by Dylan and Sol, respectively, as their most inspiring and challenging teachers. I thank these teachers for their dedication to our young people and our schools.

I am pleased to join the White House Commission on Presidential Scholars and the United States Department of Education in recognizing Dylan Neel and Sol Taubin.

#### HAMAS FUNDING

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago from this very Chamber, we heard the Israeli Prime Minister make clear that Israel seeks a permanent peace settlement with recognition of a Palestinian state. He reiterated that Israel seeks peace with its neighbors. Unfortunately, some of its neighbors do not feel the same way.

The charter of Hamas clearly states that peaceful solutions are contrary to their beliefs. As a party, they stand for the destruction of Israel, they glorify the murders of women and children, and even mourn the death of Osama bin Laden. Despite these positions, Hamas was recently welcomed back in to the Palestinian Government, and Egypt has opened the border to the Gaza Strip.

By no means should U.S. taxpayer money go to support these murderers. We cannot support a Palestinian Government that has no intention to live peacefully with its free and democratic neighbor. We must stop sending hundreds of millions of dollars in annual aid until all parties in the Palestinian Government recognize that Israel has a right to exist.

#### TERROR GAP

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, shockingly, individuals on the Federal terrorist watch list are not excluded from purchasing firearms in the United States. Quite simply, this means you can be on a terrorist watch list and be prohibited from boarding a plane because we think you are a terrorist, but you can buy a semiautomatic weapon.

Last week, American-born al Qaeda spokesman Adam Gadahn urged the terrorist group's followers to exploit this "terror gap" in our gun laws. Our enemies, intent on destroying Americans and our way of life, have made a calculated decision that Congress cares more about protecting the gun lobby than it does the safety of its citizens. They are convinced we lack the courage and fortitude to close our gaping loopholes and that their persistent campaign to strike again on our soil has new promise.

I would love to stand here today and say our enemy has grossly underestimated us. I am not certain I can. My colleagues in Congress are now faced with a critical opportunity to do the right thing and pass the most commonsense of commonsense policies by closing the terror gap. Al Qaeda will be watching our response.

□ 1210

#### INDIANA AIR NATIONAL GUARD AIRMAN OF THE YEAR: STAFF SERGEANT ANDRE CARBONEAU

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to honor a native member of Indiana's Air National Guard today. Staff Sergeant Andre Carboneau was recently awarded Indiana Air National Guard Airman of the Year for 2010. The honorable award is designed to recognize members that are hardworking, are involved in the community, and have continued to advance themselves in education. After members compete on a quarterly basis, they compete at the State level to become the airman of the year.

Carboneau received his award Friday, May 20, at Victory Field in Indianapolis. He is from Warsaw, Indiana, and a phase aircraft mechanic for 122nd Fighter Wing in Fort Wayne, Indiana. He is also a full-time student at Indiana State University, where he is majoring in professional aviation.

I congratulate Staff Sergeant Andre Carboneau for his achievements and am proud of Indiana's 14,700 members of the Indiana Army and Air National Guard.

Our Nation owes endless gratitude to these men and women in uniform who have devoted their lives to our security and the preservation of our liberty.

#### MEDICARE VOUCHER PROGRAM

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republicans' misguided attack on Medicare and Medicaid. No matter what the other side says, their plans for Medicare and Medicaid will end them, leaving them as nothing but a shell.

This is a question of priorities. Which is the best choice? Either closing the doughnut hole so seniors, including 7,000 in my district, don't have to choose between their medications and paying the rent, or giving huge subsidies to oil companies?

Or this choice: telling people, including 100,000 in my congressional district who are in their 40s and 50s, to hurry up and save another \$200,000 each before they retire so they can pay for health care since Medicare's guarantee is gone?

Or continuing tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires?

The Republican budget is not a plan for our future. It's a recipe for disaster. It ends Medicare and Medicaid, puts our seniors at risk.

Stand up for our current and future seniors. Say "no" to the Republican attack on Medicare and Medicaid.

#### MR. PRESIDENT, WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

(Mr. HENSARLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, we found out last week that new business

creation is at a 17-year low, and Americans are asking, Mr. President, where are the jobs?

Unemployment has now languished at the highest level since the Great Depression, and Americans are asking, Mr. President, where are the jobs?

One in seven families is now on food stamps, and Americans are asking, Mr. President, where are the jobs?

The Bureau of Labor Statistics released that the time it takes to get a new job is at an all-time high, and Americans are asking, Mr. President, where are the jobs?

House Republicans have a plan for America's job creators to put the Nation on a fiscally sustainable path to restore confidence, to make our Tax Code competitive, and to take the burden of regulation off our job creators so that American workers can get the paychecks they need and deserve.

#### REPUBLICAN PLAN TO END MEDICARE AND GUT MEDICAID

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, the more we learn about the true impact of the majority's plan to end Medicare and gut the Medicaid program, the more there is to dislike.

For starters, under their plan, seniors will pay \$6,000 more in annual out-of-pocket costs for health care services. Current seniors will see higher costs on prescription drugs as a result of reopening the donut hole, as well as a spike in the price of preventative care because free annual wellness visits will be eliminated.

Individuals who are 54 years of age and younger, including 540,000 people in my district, will be denied access to Medicare's guaranteed benefits.

Additionally, the majority's budget slashes Medicaid funding by \$800 billion over 10 years and converts the program into block grants. Nearly 60 million Americans that rely on Medicaid for their health coverage will be in jeopardy of losing their health care.

From my district in particular, their plan will impair the health care of 21,000 dual eligible seniors who rely on Medicaid to supplement their Medicare coverage, and 82,000 children who receive coverage under Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, given the current economic climate, now is not the time to be cutting valuable services to our most vulnerable citizens.

#### MEDICARE HOME INFUSION BILL

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are massive inefficiencies in Medicare that are causing the program to go bankrupt. One example is infusion therapy, or the intravenous delivery of medication administered to patients suffering from cancer or seri-

ous infection for which they cannot just take a pill. But it requires specialized equipment and supervision and often lasts several hours a day over a period of several weeks. It's very expensive for patients to get this care in a hospital.

Although private plans have been covering home infusion therapy for decades, Medicare still forces people to go to a hospital, where they also have increased risk for infection by going there, and it costs thousands of dollars for delivery, as opposed to hundreds of dollars when they get it at home.

That's why today, Representative ELIOT ENGEL and I are reintroducing the Medicare Home Infusion Therapy Coverage Act, so patients can receive the same treatment in the comfort and convenience of their home at a lower cost. Our bill saves taxpayers money, about \$6 billion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, our proof is that this is one more way we can find significant savings in Medicare, or simply wait for the program to go bankrupt. And I urge all of my colleagues to support our bill to give patients better quality and better care at lower costs.

#### MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, America's seniors have given a lifetime of service to our Nation. It is our responsibility to demonstrate the same commitment to them by providing a safety net like Medicare and Medicaid.

Sadly, the Republican budget will have a devastating impact on our seniors, forcing many of them to sell their homes and rely on their children just to get by because they can't afford health coverage.

In my district alone, the Republican budget plan would throw out 3,200 Medicare beneficiaries into the prescribed donut hole, eliminate preventive care benefits for 56,000 seniors, deny 630,000 individuals aged 54 and younger guaranteed Medicare coverage, jeopardize nursing home care for 1,100 seniors whose expenses are paid by Medicare.

Yes, we must lower the deficit with intelligent spending cuts, but it is wrong to balance the budget by cutting vital service to American seniors.

Let's preserve Medicare and Medicaid. Let's work together, Republicans and Democrats, and find a solution.

#### THE IMMINENT MEDICARE CATASTROPHE

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, we are at a great turning point in history when it comes to the survival of Medicare. The CMS actuary just informed us that Medicare will become insolvent in just 12 years. That means that if

you're on Medicare, or expect to be on Medicare in the next 12 years, you need to think about how you will finance your health care after that period.

And what is the President's plan or the Democrat congressional plan? Sorry, there is no plan.

When asked, Mr. President, why no plan when the law requires you to have one? He said, and I paraphrase, that he would rather Republicans take the lead so he can demagogue ours. Never mind that ObamaCare takes one-half trillion dollars from Medicare to subsidize its crazy schemes.

The Ryan budget plan that was passed here in this Chamber has the only credible plan to save Medicare. It ensures traditional Medicare coverage indefinitely if you're over 54 years of age. It provides for a choice among many private plans with premium support based on financial need for those who are under. It is time congressional Democrats and the President step up on this vital issue.

□ 1220

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT MEDICARE

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the more people know about the Republican plan for Medicare, the less they like it. So it's no wonder that the Republicans are trying to prevent House Members from telling our constituents about the plan to end Medicare by actually censoring our mailings to our own districts.

The Democrats aren't alone in saying the Republican plan ends Medicare. Tom Scully, former Bush administration head of Medicare, says the Republican plan "gets rid of the current Medicare program" and that it is "a fundamental structural change in the program." It's so fundamental that beginning in 2022 the out-of-pocket costs for enrollees would double, and they would be forced to pick a private insurance plan without guaranteed benefits.

Republicans can call their plan whatever they want—sorta-care, maybe-care, we don't care—but they can't call it Medicare. They can try all they want, but they can't keep seniors from learning the truth.

This program that they introduced ends Medicare.

#### MEDICARE IS GOING BROKE, MR. PRESIDENT

(Mr. BROWN of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this administration has failed to lead, they have failed to budget, and now they have failed to produce any viable solution for saving Medicare. In fact, their solution is to let it go broke.

In 13 short years, Medicare's Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will run completely out of money. Bankrupting this

program will leave many of our Nation's seniors high and dry and our future generations without a health care program to depend upon.

And guess what? The Obama administration doesn't care. Instead of making Medicare reform a top priority, the administration has passed the task off to a panel of unqualified bureaucrats—like it was busy work that they couldn't be bothered with.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare is going broke. That's a reality this administration has to face. The program is already driving up the larger-than-life debt, and it will only get worse from here. I urge the administration to at least present us with one option for fixing Medicare's present money problem. And if they can't, the House GOP doctors have plenty of suggestions of where to begin.

#### REPUBLICANS ARE HIDING THE TRUTH ABOUT MEDICARE FROM THE PUBLIC

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I was a newspaper editor in Louisville, Kentucky. And as an editor, my job was to make sure that our stories revealed the truth and made things easier to understand for our readers. Right now, the Republican majority in Congress is editing to obscure the truth and to hide the facts from the American people.

Ever since a Republican candidate in New York lost a special election in a heavily Republican district because she supported the reckless GOP plan to end Medicare, the majority in this body has been petrified about what it might mean for their political careers if the American people actually found out the truth, and they are doing everything they can to hide the truth.

The Republican-controlled Franking Commission—which controls content of mailings from congressional offices—is now dictating that any reference to the end of Medicare be cut out from correspondence. Whenever the word “end” is used, they say we have to use the word “change.” They won't let the truth be told. But the truth is, if you have eliminated something, you haven't changed it. You can't change something that has been killed. That's what the American people need to know. That's what the Republican majority is trying to hide, but they will not deceive the American people.

#### HAPPY 236TH BIRTHDAY TO THE U.S. ARMY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the birthday of the United States Army; 236 years ago, the United States Army was established to defend our families.

The Army began June 14, 1775 as the Continental Army. The Continental Congress established the Army to coordinate military efforts among the 13 independent colonies.

With victory in the Cold War, more people and more countries today live in democracy, freedom and peace than in the history of the world due to the success of America's military. Promoting the values of loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity and personal courage, today's soldiers represent the best of our Nation.

As the grateful son of an Army Air Corps Flying Tiger and as a 31-year veteran of the Army Reserves and Army National Guard, I know firsthand the competence and patriotism of servicemembers. Especially my wife, Roxanne, and I are grateful to have three sons currently serving in the Army National Guard. My youngest son, Second Lieutenant Hunter Taylor Wilson, was commissioned last month an engineer through the Clemson University ROTC.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### CENSORSHIP BY FRANKING COMMISSION

(Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to object to the majority Franking Commission's exercise in blatant and transparent censorship on a Medicare mailing I and other colleagues of mine wish to send to our constituents.

I'm not allowed to call it the “Ryan budget” even though the Republicans called it the Ryan budget, because, of course, it has become unpopular. I'm not allowed to refer to changing Medicare to a voucher system even though Mr. RYAN himself referred to it as a voucher system. I must now call it a “premium support system.”

These changes, among many others, are censorship at its worst. When we don't like something, when it's not going well for us on the majority side, we suppress it. This censorship would make former Soviet censors blush at the breathtaking nature and sweeping scope of the suppression of free expression, of free ideas here in the Nation's Capitol.

#### REPUBLICANS WORKING TO CREATE JOBS

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about jobs.

Last week, during the district work period, I met with local business leaders, toured businesses throughout my district, and listened to their concerns. It should not come as a surprise to

anyone the main topic of conversation was where are the jobs and what is the state of the economy.

Over and over, the small business leaders told me that government regulations and uncertainty are negatively affecting their ability to grow and create jobs. Businesses are afraid to invest in the future due to the uncertainty in our Tax Code, the increased costs and regulations stemming from the Affordable Care Act—which they can't afford—and the increased burdens of an out-of-control regulatory process that has stifled job creation.

Just yesterday, the National Federation of Independent Business released their report showing a decline in optimism for small businesses for a third consecutive month. It has been 28 months since the ill-conceived stimulus passed and a year since June 2010 was declared “recovery summer” by the administration; yet 1.9 million fewer Americans have jobs. This is why we need to get our fiscal house in order, cut spending, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and end onerous regulations.

The Republican majority gets the message, and everything we're doing is to create a climate where we can expand and create jobs in America.

□ 1230

#### EMPOWERING BUSINESSES TO GET ECONOMY GOING

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that Illinois' corporate tax rate is the fourth-highest in the Nation and yet ranks 48th in economic performance. Businesses, big and small, can no longer afford to keep their doors open and hire more workers when they face a 45 percent tax increase.

If we are serious about creating jobs, then we must stop allowing the government to pick winners and losers in today's economy. In order to create economic certainty, we must have a level playing field and clearly defined rules that don't change halfway through the game. We need to encourage businesses to invest and to expand here at home. One way that we can do that is through corporate tax reform, eliminating tax loopholes that currently exist in the system.

One thing is clear: Increases in taxes without spending reform cannot work. It is time that we start to empower businesses to get our economy moving again. Illinois has lost 750,000 manufacturing jobs over the last decade. Now is the time we have to focus on job creation.

#### A REAL, ACTIONABLE JOBS PLAN FOR AMERICA IS NEEDED

(Mr. QUAYLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, President Obama made a joke about his so-called stimulus package. Remember those shovel-ready projects we heard so much about? They were one of the major selling points for the package. Well, the President now says they "were not as shovel-ready as we expected." I am sure some got a good chuckle out of that line, but there is nothing funny about a \$1 trillion failure.

The economic policies this administration has pursued have failed to create jobs, and they have made matters worse for our economy. In many of our home States, the economic situation is bleaker than the national picture. In my hometown of Phoenix, Arizona, our unemployment rate is higher than the national average, and we have lost thousands of manufacturing and retail jobs over the last 2 years. We also have a housing market that has collapsed.

Mr. Speaker, we will never get our economy growing again unless we see drastic improvements in unemployment and our housing sector. Our country is at our best when we unleash the ingenuity of the American people. The Republican Conference has a real and actionable jobs plan that will put America back to work, that will give our entrepreneurs and innovators freedom from the regulatory burdens and high taxes that are holding them back.

We must take action to get this economy going again, and that is what our plan does. President Obama's speeches, policies, and council meetings are not enough.

#### REPEAL AND REPLACE THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE PLAN

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recall a promise that we heard many times from this President and his administration: that under his health care law, if you like your insurance, you can keep it. Unfortunately, it seems that that promise was an empty one, and it will affect millions of Americans.

A recent study from McKinsey & Company found that due to the law, at least 30 percent and perhaps as many as half of employers say that they will probably or definitely stop offering health care coverage to their employees after 2014. These are astounding statistics, and they reveal the fallacy we heard so frequently that if you like your plan, you can keep it.

With every passing day we find out more and more what is in the President's health care law, and we find out that it hurts middle class families and small business owners, holding back our economy and killing job creation. This study is just one more reason for the House to redouble its efforts to repeal this law and replace it with legislation that will control the cost of health care while preserving individual freedoms.

#### HONORING JIM SACKETT

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jim Sackett, who this week announced he is retiring after 33 years in remarkable service as the anchor of WPTV News Channel 5 in West Palm Beach.

I have enjoyed Jim's newscasts since my family moved to Palm Beach Gardens in 1984. In high school, I wanted to go into the news business and actually interned under Jim at Channel 5. I learned a lot that semester watching Jim, whose commitment to balanced news reporting set a high standard for other newscasters. His dedication to quality news coverage has earned him both a Telly and an Emmy.

Before he began his career in journalism, Jim served his country honorably for 5 years in the United States Army. He continues to serve our community, where he is active in several organizations, including Big Brothers and Big Sisters. Jim is widely recognized for his "Thursday's Child" feature, which for 30 years profiled children to help them find forever adoptive parents.

Jim, thank you for your service and your contributions to our community. You are truly a pillar of the Treasure Coast and Palm Beach County.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

□ 1303

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Georgia) at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

#### AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 300 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2112.

□ 1304

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and

Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. BASS of New Hampshire (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 14, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 26, line 17.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of lands, water, and interests therein for use in the plant materials program by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100 pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a); purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, \$770,956,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for construction and improvement of buildings and public improvements at plant materials centers, except that the cost of alterations and improvements to other buildings and other public improvements shall not exceed \$250,000: *Provided further*, That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land, that the right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a.

#### WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Under the authorities of Section 14 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, \$15,000,000 is provided.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 27, line 23, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Page 80, line 2, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would eliminate one of the 20 different conservation programs USDA currently operates, the water rehabilitation program. The chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend from Georgia, has stated during debate on funding for agriculture programs that he hopes to see a reduction in the number of Federal programs included in this bill.



I understand that some of my colleagues have a vested interest in this program, but when we have a program that is funding projects in only a handful of States, we must take a long, hard look at our priorities.

Mr. Chairman, even the President did not request funding for this program. It cannot be understated that we are facing unprecedented fiscal challenges in our Nation. We just simply have to stop spending money that we don't have, and we have to start creating jobs out in the private sector. My amendment, by cutting this program, will help to stop the bleeding economically that we're having. The consequences of failing to reduce spending and the deficit jeopardize the current and future stability of our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this amendment, and I think it might be worthwhile to explain for just a moment what the small watershed program is and what the small watershed rehabilitation program is all about.

These were efforts begun in the 1940s and 1950s by this body in an effort to address flooding conditions. Under this program, 10,000 small earthen dams were built across the country, working in interlocking series to prevent downstream flooding by capturing flood waters at the source.

Now, like anything after 50 years, its life expectancy can be expected to come to a conclusion. In 2000, we created the rehabilitation program to extend the life of these structures by additional time, and it now appears, based on the modern techniques being used, engineering technologies, that these 50-year structures will wind up with a 150-year total life expectancy in many instances.

This is a program where the rehabilitation resources are allocated based on need as scored by USDA. It's not an earmark program. It's not a targeted program. The money is made available, and as the structures need work, they are prioritized. It's a wonderful way to address this issue.

Now, if you look at the amount of property and life and infrastructure that have been protected in the life of these programs, it's almost incalculable. In Oklahoma, in the range of \$81 million a year worth of property has been saved.

My colleague alluded to programs that only affect limited numbers of areas. I would note even in the great State of Georgia, there are 357 of these watershed structures. There are 69 that within the next 10 years will need the rehabilitation program. There are benefits in every State.

I would just simply say, if you care and you believe that infrastructure is a part of our responsibility, if you believe that protecting every life below that dam all the way to the ocean is important, and the property, then this is a wise, small use of resources. What my friend attempts to do here is to zero out the whole program. No money for rehab this year. No money for rehab this year.

□ 1310

That would be a travesty. That would be a tragic use of resources in the past. It's important, I think, that we continue this program.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. As the chairman of Agriculture knows and is fully aware, I wanted to underscore the point that you just made that the ordinary mandatory authorization for this program is \$165 million. That has been zeroed out, and the only thing we're doing this year is this \$15 million. And so even at the current \$15 million level, it's still 150 less than it ordinarily has been.

Mr. LUCAS. I would say, reclaiming my time, that the gentleman is right. This is a dramatic reduction over what had been expected during the farm bill. Yet this \$15 million will do tremendous work, and it is allocated on a 65-35 cost basis. Local and State government have to come up with more than a third of the money to be able to implement these rehabilitation programs.

For a few pennies, we do a great deal across the country based on need, not anyone's political priorities but based on need. This is an exceptional program. I would ask my colleagues to turn back this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE III

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT

#### OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development, \$760,000.

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

#### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs in the Rural Development mission area, including activities with institutions concerning the development and operation of agricultural cooperatives; and for cooperative agreements; \$161,011,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this section may be used for advertising and promotional activities that support the Rural Development mission area: *Provided further*, That not more than \$10,000 may be expended to provide modest non-monetary awards to non-USDA

employees: *Provided further*, That any balances available from prior years for the Rural Utilities Service, Rural Housing Service, and the Rural Business-Cooperative Service salaries and expenses accounts shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

#### RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

#### RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

#### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, to be available from funds in the rural housing insurance fund, as follows: \$24,845,666,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, of which \$845,666,000 shall be for direct loans, and of which \$24,000,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; and \$58,617,000 for section 515 rental housing loans.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: \$40,000,000 for 502 direct loans; and \$20,000,000 for repair, rehabilitation, and new construction of section 515 rental housing: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated in this paragraph, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account funds allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2011, shall be available through June 30, 2012, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

In addition, for the cost of direct loans, grants, and contracts, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1484 and 1486, \$12,500,000, to remain available until expended, for direct farm labor housing loans and domestic farm labor housing grants and contracts: *Provided*, That any balances available for the Farm Labor Program Account shall be transferred and merged with this account.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$400,000,000 shall be paid to the appropriation for "Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses".

#### RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) or agreements entered into in lieu of debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Housing Act of 1949, \$890,000,000; and, in addition, such sums as may be necessary, as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, to liquidate debt incurred prior to fiscal year 1992 to carry out the rental assistance program under section 521(a)(2) of the Act: *Provided*, That of this amount not less than \$1,500,000 is available for newly constructed units financed by section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949, and not less than \$2,500,000 is for newly constructed units financed under sections 514 and 516 of the Housing Act of 1949: *Provided further*, That rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed during the current fiscal year shall be funded for a one-year period: *Provided further*, That any unexpended balances remaining at the end of such one-year agreements may be transferred and used for the purposes of any debt reduction; maintenance, repair, or rehabilitation of any existing projects; preservation; and rental assistance activities authorized under title V of the Act: *Provided further*, That rental assistance provided under agreements entered into prior to fiscal year 2012 for a farm labor multi-family housing project financed under section 514 or 516 of the Act may not be recaptured for use in

another project until such assistance has remained unused for a period of 12 consecutive months, if such project has a waiting list of tenants seeking such assistance or the project has rental assistance eligible tenants who are not receiving such assistance: *Provided further*, That such recaptured rental assistance shall, to the extent practicable, be applied to another farm labor multi-family housing project financed under section 514 or 516 of the Act.

MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING REVITALIZATION  
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the rural housing voucher program as authorized under section 542 of the Housing Act of 1949, but notwithstanding subsection (b) of such section, \$11,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available for rural housing vouchers to any low-income household (including those not receiving rental assistance) residing in a property financed with a section 515 loan which has been prepaid after September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That the amount of such voucher shall be the difference between comparable market rent for the section 515 unit and the tenant-paid rent for such unit: *Provided further*, That funds made available for such vouchers shall be subject to the availability of annual appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, administer such vouchers with current regulations and administrative guidance applicable to section 8 housing vouchers administered by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 35, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 49, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$200,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I am offering an amendment that reduces the funding for the billion dollar Food for Peace program. Regardless of its perceived merits, our country is deep in debt, and we have problems here in America, particularly rural America, that need to be addressed.

The Food for Peace program has been rightly criticized as a waste of money and ineffective in achieving its stated goals. But the reason for my amendments are more direct: the current budget funding for this program is over \$1 billion. We stand today with a \$14.3 trillion deficit, and at the same time, we have unmet needs in our own backyards.

My first amendment cuts \$200 million from this program and my second amendment sets aside \$100 million into the spending reduction account. Then, of the \$200 million cut in my first amendment, \$100 million each is directed into Rural Development, Title III, here in the United States.

The reason for these amendments is straightforward. Parts of rural America rival parts of some Third World countries where we send tens of mil-

lions of dollars. We need to focus on our own people and our own communities before we spend taxpayer money in foreign lands.

One example here in the United States is the area known as the former Bennett Freeze area, an area consisting of 1.5 million acres of Navajo Nation reservation land, where the housing units have been described as “little more than hovels” and “80 percent of the homes have no electricity” and there are few paved road or communication structures. How do we justify spending \$1 billion in foreign countries when we have so many unmet needs in the United States?

The Rural Development loan program would receive additional funding under this amendment, a program that gets high marks for its success; so, too, would the Multifamily Housing Revitalization Program. With millions of people losing homes, they are moving into multiunit housing. This program will help Americans.

It is easy to understand the emotional appeal programs like Food for Peace may have, a program that would be reduced by this amendment. But ultimately, we are using taxpayer money for charity. Improving literacy, reducing hunger, and educating girls in foreign countries are issues that are, in fact, charitable and emotionally appealing, but we have our own literacy, hunger, and gender issues in our country. But at a time when we have a \$14.3 trillion public debt, massive unemployment, and rural rates of poverty, illiteracy, and school underperformance, we should focus our money here at home. We owe it to our constituents, the taxpayers, to help them. Certainly one can see that this program has laudable aspirations, but laudable aspirations will not help the U.S. economy or the U.S. taxpayer. The problems in rural America are staggering.

On June 9, 2011, President Obama issued an Executive order to create a commission to study problems in rural America. In the Executive order, the President stated:

“Sixteen percent of the American population lives in rural counties. Strong, sustainable rural communities are essential to winning the future and ensuring American competitiveness in the years ahead. These communities supply our food, fiber, and energy, safeguard our natural resources, and are essential in the development of science and innovation. Though rural communities face numerous challenges, they also present enormous economic potential. The Federal Government has an important role to play in order to expand access to capital necessary for economic growth, promote innovation, improve access to health care and education, and expand outdoor recreational activities on public lands.”

I agree. But instead of just forming a committee to study the problems, problems that are well-known and need no further study, my amendment would do something about it and direct

money to the Multifamily Housing Revitalization Account Program for a rural housing voucher program and the Rural Business Program Account, which provides loan guarantees and grants for “rural businesses development programs,” including business grants to Indian tribes and rural economic partnership zones for farm and rural development.

Again, instead of just studying the problems of high unemployment, lagging schools, lagging infrastructure and opportunities, let's do something about it. The rural American poverty rate has exceeded the national rate since 2001 by 3 percentage points. The child poverty rate in rural America is 5 percentage points higher than urban-metro areas.

Why can't we invest millions in our rural communities instead? Why should we tolerate poverty, unemployment, and a lack of infrastructure in our rural communities while we send millions and billions of dollars to build up other countries?

In good faith, knowing how hard so many people in my district work and knowing how little they have to show for it at the end of the day, I can't agree to send their money overseas to help others while they suffer in our backyards. Knowing that infrastructure is lacking, this amendment helps start the process of directing our money to the unmet needs here in the United States.

I ask my colleagues to closely consider these amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I wanted to make a few notes on it. I appreciate my friend for offering it, and I think he's raised some very serious philosophical questions, particularly about Pub.L. 490, the foreign food program.

I wanted to point out we have reduced that by 31 percent in this account, but we've also reduced the Multifamily Housing Revitalization Account, as he's well aware, but his amendment would actually increase that 10 times. It's at \$11 million, and he would bring that up to \$111 million. The highest funding level for that was in FY 2010 at \$43 million, and so we have been ratcheting it down using a voucher program but feel that it was overfunded.

□ 1320

The Rural Business Program Account right now is about \$64 million, so this amendment almost doubles that. It doesn't quite double it. But there again, we have brought that account down from a high of \$97 million; and with his amendment, it would go up to \$164 million. These two accounts would go to higher levels than they historically had. And in contrast, the PL 480, the foreign food program, is at one of

the lower levels that it has been at. So I have to say to my friend that I'm sorry to reluctantly oppose you, but we are going to oppose the amendment at this point.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I think the amendment is well intended. I think the author is well intended. Rural America is hurting. Rural America is really under a depression. We have not done a very good job of having a rural strategy for America.

I applaud Secretary Vilsack for trying to pull together programs to invest in rural America and make sure that the different agencies in the Federal Government are working in collaboration. And I think this amendment addresses some of those issues, not in a collaborative way but just in putting more money into rural America. But unfortunately, that good intent is offset by the evil done in taking it out of the foreign ag account. And I can't support the amendment for that.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), \$22,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Mutual and Self-Help Housing Grants allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2011, shall be available through June 30, 2012, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I rise to engage in a colloquy with my friend from California (Mr. FARR) about cuts in this legislation.

As I have been analyzing the legislation coming before us, Mr. FARR, it appears that the legislation, if approved in the form that is before us, would have a really devastating impact upon American farmers, families, and the environment. The legislation before us, as I understand it, cuts nearly \$1 billion from the five main conservation programs, conservation programs that

put money directly in the pockets of family farmers.

Over the last 5 years, these programs have been so popular that the list of farmers who want to participate greatly outweighs the availability. Both the Conservation Stewardship Program and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program have twice as many applicants as they can serve. And the Wetlands Reserve Program and the Grasslands Reserve Program combined have over 1 million acres waiting to apply.

These are not programs that are underutilized or ineffective. They appear to be widely popular and provide a direct benefit to America's farmers and ranchers. These would appear to be exactly the type of programs we should be supporting. They provide support for family farms and producers who are doing exactly the right thing, ensuring that we use precious tax dollars not only to support farmers and ranchers but to ensure clean water, clean air, and fertile productive soil.

They are a blueprint for a better path forward, a farm bill that helps farmers add value and truly supports small- and mid-sized operations. I was wondering if you would care to comment on my concerns.

Mr. FARR. I appreciate my good friend from Oregon's (Mr. BLUMENAUER) sentiments. And as ranking member of the House Ag Appropriations Subcommittee, I am a strong supporter of these conservation programs used both in Oregon and in my State of California. And I am distressed by the proposed cuts to these programs.

I would like to point out that the Farm Bureau also opposes large cuts to the important working lands program and the Environment Quality Incentives Program. I find it especially disappointing that these funding levels are low enough that the USDA will have to break current contracts. That is an unfair result for our farmers and ranchers who have counted on the support and technical assistance for the year ahead.

The funding levels for the 2008 farm bill were carefully negotiated, and it is frustrating to me and to many others to see the mandatory funding for conservation programs decrease so drastically because this bill was given such a low allocation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the sentiments of my good friend from California, as I appreciate his leadership on issues that relate to both agriculture and protecting the environment.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that Members will spend time looking at what this means to farmers and ranchers in their communities and hope that as the legislation works its way through Congress, we will be able to reverse these efforts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For grants and contracts for very low-income housing repair made by the Rural Housing Service, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1474, \$32,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Housing Assistance Grants allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2011, shall be available through June 30, 2012, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 33, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$20,480,000)".

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,480,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I rise to offer my amendment, which would reduce the budget for the Rural Housing Assistance Grants Program by over \$20 million. My amendment would drop the allocation for this program from \$32 million to just around \$12 million. This is a modest request, particularly considering the President initially asked for a funding level of just \$12 million, and we would simply be dropping the levels back down to what the administration, itself, requested.

It is absolutely critical that this Congress cut spending wherever possible; and if the President could do without that extra \$20 million, so can we. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. It's very interesting that your colleague from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) just a minute ago was trying to add money to this account because of the catastrophe in rural America. This Rural Housing Assistance Grants Program is primarily to repair very low-income rural housing. This account was increased from the request of the President by the committee. The effect of this amendment would be to knock it back, and the reason the committee increased it was because of the need out there.

We know what kind of a housing crisis we're having in America, particularly when people have no other place to go. This allows the lowest of income people in the poorest areas in the country, in rural America, to have some assistance to upgrade their houses so that the cost of high utility bills can be brought down with weatherization upgrades and things like that. I mean,

this is not a smart cut. This will be hurting the people who can least afford it and at a time when they most need it, and I would oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM  
ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans and grants for rural community facilities programs as authorized by section 306 and described in section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, \$18,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$3,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be available for a Rural Community Development Initiative: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be used solely to develop the capacity and ability of private, non-profit community-based housing and community development organizations, low-income rural communities, and Federally Recognized Native American Tribes to undertake projects to improve housing, community facilities, community and economic development projects in rural areas: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be made available to qualified private, non-profit and public intermediary organizations proposing to carry out a program of financial and technical assistance: *Provided further*, That such intermediary organizations shall provide matching funds from other sources, including Federal funds for related activities, in an amount not less than funds provided: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Community Facilities Program Account funds allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2011, shall be available through June 30, 2012, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the rural community programs described in section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act: *Provided further*, That sections 381E-H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to the funds made available under this heading.

RURAL BUSINESS—COOPERATIVE SERVICE

RURAL BUSINESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of loan guarantees and grants, for the rural business development programs authorized by sections 306 and 310B and described in section 381E(d)(3) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, \$64,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed \$500,000 shall be made available for a grant to a qualified national organization to provide technical assistance for rural transportation in order to promote economic development: *Provided further*, That \$2,250,000 shall be for grants to the Delta Regional Authority (7 U.S.C. 2009aa et seq.) for any Rural Community Advancement Program purpose as described in section 381E(d) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, of which not more than 5 percent may be used for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That \$3,400,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for business grants to benefit Federally Recognized Native Amer-

ican Tribes, including \$250,000 for a grant to a qualified national organization to provide technical assistance for rural transportation in order to promote economic development: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Business Program Account funds allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2011, shall be available through June 30, 2012, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the rural business and cooperative development programs described in section 381E(d)(3) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act: *Provided further*, That sections 381E-H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to funds made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That any prior balances in the Rural Development, Rural Community Advancement Program account for programs authorized by sections 306 and 310B and described in section 381E(d)(3) of such Act be transferred and merged with this account and any other prior balances from the Rural Development, Rural Community Advancement Program account that the Secretary determines is appropriate to transfer.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM  
ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)), \$14,758,000.

For the cost of direct loans, \$5,000,000, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)), of which \$750,000 shall be available through June 30, 2012, for Federally Recognized Native American Tribes; and of which \$1,500,000 shall be available through June 30, 2012, for Mississippi Delta Regional counties (as determined in accordance with Public Law 100-460): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account funds allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2011, shall be available through June 30, 2012, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan programs, \$3,500,000 shall be paid to the appropriation for "Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses".

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS  
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING CANCELLATION OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, \$33,077,000.

Of the funds derived from interest on the cushion of credit payments, as authorized by section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, \$155,000,000 shall not be obligated and \$155,000,000 are hereby permanently cancelled.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For rural cooperative development grants authorized under section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932), \$22,500,000 of which, \$2,000,000 shall be for cooperative agreements for the appropriate technology transfer for rural areas program: *Provided*, That, not to exceed \$3,000,000 shall be for cooperatives or associa-

tions of cooperatives whose primary focus is to provide assistance to small, socially disadvantaged producers and whose governing board and/or membership is comprised of at least 75 percent socially disadvantaged members; and of which \$12,500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for value-added agricultural product market development grants, as authorized by section 231 of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1621 note).

RURAL ENERGY FOR AMERICA PROGRAM

For the cost of a program of loan guarantees and grants, under the same terms and conditions as authorized by section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107), \$1,300,000: *Provided*, That the cost of loan guarantees, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans and grants for the rural water, waste water, waste disposal, and solid waste management programs authorized by sections 306, 306A, 306C, 306D, 306E, and 310B and described in sections 306C(a)(2), 306D, 306E, and 381E(d)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, \$500,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$497,000 shall be available for the rural utilities program described in section 306(a)(2)(B) of such Act, and of which not to exceed \$993,000 shall be available for the rural utilities program described in section 306E of such Act: *Provided*, That \$65,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for loans and grants including water and waste disposal systems grants authorized by 306C(a)(2)(B) and 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, Federally-recognized Native American Tribes authorized by 306C(a)(1), and the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (of the State of Hawaii): *Provided further*, That funding provided for section 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act may be provided to a consortium formed pursuant to section 325 of Public Law 105-83: *Provided further*, That not more than 2 percent of the funding provided for section 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act may be used by the State of Alaska and/or by a consortium formed pursuant to section 325 of Public Law 105-83 for training and technical assistance programs: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$19,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for technical assistance grants for rural water and waste systems pursuant to section 306(a)(14) of such Act, unless the Secretary makes a determination of extreme need, of which \$3,400,000 shall be made available for a grant to a qualified non-profit multi-state regional technical assistance organization, with experience in working with small communities on water and waste water problems, the principal purpose of such grant shall be to assist rural communities with populations of 3,300 or less, in improving the planning, financing, development, operation, and management of water and waste water systems, and of which not less than \$800,000 shall be for a qualified national Native American organization to provide technical assistance for rural water systems for tribal communities: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$14,000,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be for contracting with qualified national organizations for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,400,000 shall be

for solid waste management grants: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, the amount equal to the amount of Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program Account funds allocated by the Secretary for Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the fiscal year 2011, shall be available through June 30, 2012, for communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones for the rural utilities programs described in section 381E(d)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act: *Provided further*, That sections 381E-H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to the funds made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That any prior balances in the Rural Development, Rural Community Advancement Program account programs authorized by sections 306, 306A, 306C, 306D, 306E, and 310B and described in sections 306C(a)(2), 306D, 306E, and 381E(d)(2) of such Act be transferred to and merged with this account and any other prior balances from the Rural Development, Rural Community Advancement Program account that the Secretary determines is appropriate to transfer.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by sections 305 and 306 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 935 and 936) shall be made as follows: 5 percent rural electrification loans, \$100,000,000; loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, rural electric, \$6,500,000,000; 5 percent rural telecommunications loans, \$145,000,000; cost of money rural telecommunications loans, \$250,000,000; and for loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, rural telecommunications loans, \$295,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$30,000,000, which shall be paid to the appropriation for "Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses".

DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM  
(INCLUDING CANCELLATION OF FUNDS)

For grants for telemedicine and distance learning services in rural areas, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 950aaa et seq., \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD, NUTRITION AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, \$689,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), except section 21, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), except sections 17 and 21; \$18,770,571,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013, of which such sums as are made available under section 14222(b)(1) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246), as amended by this Act, shall be merged with and available for the same time period and purposes as provided herein: *Provided*, That of the total amount available, \$16,516,000 shall be available to carry out section 19 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.): *Provided further*, That section 14222(b)(1) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of

2008 is amended by adding at the end before the period, "except section 21, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), except sections 17 and 21".

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental nutrition program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), \$6,048,250,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 17(h)(10) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(10)), of the amounts made available under this heading, not less than \$14,000,000 shall be used for infrastructure, not less than \$50,000,000 shall be used for management information systems, not less than \$75,000,000 shall be used for breastfeeding peer counselors and other related activities, and not less than \$7,500,000 shall be used for breastfeeding performance awards: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this account shall be available for the purchase of infant formula except in accordance with the cost containment and competitive bidding requirements specified in section 17 of such Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided shall be available for activities that are not fully reimbursed by other Federal Government departments or agencies unless authorized by section 17 of such Act.

□ 1330

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 19, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$604,000,000)".

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$604,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this Nation has almost a \$14.5 trillion debt. Forty cents of every dollar the Federal Government spends, we're borrowing. We've just got to stop the outrageous spending that's going on here in Washington. And both parties have been guilty over the years.

This amendment would simply cut 10 percent out of a program—10 percent. Some people say, well, it's just a small amount of money. But as I was doing a town hall meeting back, during last week, in Georgia, in Hoschton, Georgia, one lady got up and said, \$1 million makes a lot of difference. It is a lot of money.

This does cut a great deal of money out of this program. But, Mr. Chairman, we just have to stop spending money that we don't have. It's just absolutely critical. The economy depends upon it. Creating jobs in the private sector depends upon it. The future of our Nation depends upon it.

We're in an economic emergency, Mr. Chairman, and if we don't stop spending money that we don't have, we're going to have an economic collapse of this Nation.

I'm a physician. I've worked in emergency rooms. I've seen a doctor open up

a man's chest and do open-heart massage in the emergency room trying to keep a patient alive.

It's time for open-heart massage of our economy. We've got to stop spending money that we don't have. We've got to put this country back on the right financial course and start creating jobs out in the private sector. And my amendment will be just one small step towards that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues will support this amendment so that we can put this country back on the right course, so that we can create jobs in the private sector and can have a strong economy again.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I would be curious if, at your town hall meeting, you got up and asked people would you rather take \$604 million out of the program that feeds women, infants, and children or would you like to take \$604 million out of the Defense Department for a war that we're putting on a credit card, for an Afghan war that we're putting on a credit card, the Iraq war we're putting on a credit card, or the prescription drug program that wasn't paid for under the Republican program? How about asking the people's choices?

We just authorized a defense bill in committee where we talked about billions and billions of dollars, and those are all borrowed money. So why don't we get our priorities straight?

We spent 3 hours here last night discussing what the implications are of cutting the WIC program. I don't think this is a country that wants to balance its budget on the backs of the poorest people in the United States, on the people most vulnerable, on the people that need just basic services. And that's what this amendment does.

Mr. BROUN, I know you're interested in cutting, squeezing, and trimming, but there are places to do that, and this is not one of them. Certainly, if you were here on the floor listening to the passions of last night, of 3 hours of debate on what the implications were for cutting the WIC program—and it seems that none of that was listened to by you because this is an amendment that goes right back to reducing that account by \$604 million.

Take the money out of the people most vulnerable in the United States to write down the deficit and ignore the Defense Department, ignore the spending for weapons programs, ignore the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, ignore everything that is with DOD, and expose everything that's with people in poverty.

This is a wrong amendment, and I hope it's soundly defeated.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In answer to your question, I want to do both. I think every dollar that the Federal Government spends needs to be looked at, and we're spending money that we don't have, even in DOD. I think we would cut a lot of funding there, particularly with the wasteful spending that the Department of Defense does that we all recognize.

So I want to do it all. The thing is, if we continue down this road that we're on economically, everybody's going to be poor. Nobody's going to have money for any groceries. Nobody's going to be able to get any health care. We're just going to be in a financial quagmire as a nation. And so it's absolutely critical, in my opinion, that we do emergent procedures to try to get this country back on the right course economically.

So, to answer to your question that you asked me very graciously, I answer, yes, we need to do all of the above, and I am eager to do both.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think Dr. BROUN has raised a lot of good points in terms of our financial future. In America today, for every dollar we spend, 40 cents is borrowed. The national debt right now is 95 percent of the GDP. Clearly, we have to make some very difficult choices ahead. And that's why, in this committee mark, we actually have reduced WIC funding already \$686 million.

Now, these numbers aren't random. WIC participation in 2010 was 9.2 million; in 2011, it's 8.9 million. Our committee mark for FY 2012 contemplates a participation level of 8.3 million. However, if the economy does not improve and the number goes back up, with contingency funds, we have enough money to fund a participation level of over 9 million.

But it's very difficult, Mr. Chairman, because, as we said many times during yesterday's debate, the only budget that has actually passed either House is the Ryan budget, and our 302(b) allocation funding level comes from that budget. The President's own budget failed in the Senate 97-0. The Democrat leadership in the Senate is unable to pass a budget. They're not trying to pass a budget.

So using the 302(b) allocation which we have, we have come up with these numbers, not done in random, not done with any recklessness at all. We're trying to be very careful to make sure no one falls through the crack.

But because this is a delicate card house, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1340

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 45, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

Page 45, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,500,000)".

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$82,500,000)".

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, my amendment today is an effort to save taxpayers' hard-earned money by ending funding for an unnecessary program that spends money coming to the Federal Government from our hardworking taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I very much believe in breast-feeding. We wouldn't have a human race here today if it weren't for the fact that breast-feeding has been in existence since the beginning of time; however, I am opposed to the Federal Government funding breast-feeding programs.

Under the special supplemental program for women, infants and children, or the WIC program, Congress directed the United States Department of Agriculture to create a national program for the promotion of breast-feeding. In fiscal 2010, the Federal Government spent \$85 million to educate women on how to breast-feed.

We are facing a national debt of over \$14 trillion. Spending taxpayer money to promote breast-feeding is simply not the proper role of the Federal Government and serves to illustrate just one reason—government mission creep—that we are so deeply in debt.

In the last 10 years, administrative costs for the WIC program have grown by 72 percent while enrollment has increased by only 26 percent. It is difficult to understand how this program's bureaucracy has grown three times as fast as its enrollment. Again, it's an accepted fact that breast-feeding is good for infants and mothers, and I support mothers who choose to breast-feed, but coaching women on breast-feeding is not the role of Washington.

This program came to my attention earlier this year because of the budget crunches that all levels of government are feeling. I was contacted by counties in North Carolina about this program, and it was brought to my attention that most of the money is being used

to pay salaries and benefits, some is being used for travel expenses, and some is being used for cell phone use so that the peer counselors are available 24 hours a day to the people that they are counseling.

My colleagues across the aisle will shout about this, and I may even be opposed by my colleagues on this side of the aisle, but last year my colleagues across the aisle cut more than \$550 million from the WIC program to fund unrelated activities at the USDA. These were totally unrelated. It was obviously not a high priority then.

If we want to promote the health and well-being of women, infants and children, then let's get serious about it by creating a job-friendly environment that puts people back to work and allows American families to keep more of what they earn. Let's stop spending money on every well-intentioned program and return the Federal Government to its constitutionally mandated purposes.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are tired of Washington taking their hard-earned dollars in taxes and wasting it on a bloated Federal bureaucracy. It's time we stop the culture of spending in Washington. That's why I urge adoption of my amendment, which will save taxpayers \$82.5 million in just 1 year. The money will go into the Spending Reduction Account. And I want to say my total concern here is the spending of hard-earned taxpayers' dollars on a program that the Federal Government has no business running.

Mr. Chairman, it has come to my attention that I need to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and offer an amendment that was not printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$82,500,000)".

Page 45, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

Page 45, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,500,000)".

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$82,500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I will not take advantage of this mistake that I made. I appreciate the indulgence of the ranking member and the chair of the committee, and I will just say that I would appreciate very much having the support for my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.



Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, again, how many times do they have to keep attacking the WIC account, women, infant and children?

America has long decided that we ought to be taking care of the most vulnerable people in America. There are women who are pregnant, low-income, and what we've found is if you don't invest in teaching them how to have proper nutrition during their pregnancy, you have a risk of having a low-weight baby. A low-weight baby, as Dr. McDERMOTT told us yesterday on the floor, can cost up to a quarter of a million dollars in incubation and hospital costs, and this is preventable with good nutrition.

We go on to teach women, once that baby is born, how to breast-feed that child. We know that is good health practices. And then we keep the children with nutrition in the first 5 years. That's why it's called women, infant and children; it's about pregnancy, birth and raising that child. And this amendment wants to take \$82 million out of that program which instructs women how to do proper breast-feeding and works with the States to do educational programs.

We spent 3 hours last night debating the consequences of these cuts. And it's one of those penny-wise, super-pound foolish. It's also one of those where you know the cost of everything and the value of nothing. There is a lot of value in keeping women well nourished during pregnancy and certainly keeping that newborn child well fed and nourished.

To strike money from this program is ill founded, and I strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), who is an expert on this topic and whom I rely on. And I want to thank the gentlelady for her comments today.

Ms. FOXX. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me.

I think it's unfortunate that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle characterize our doing our best to bring fiscal sanity to this country by saying that we do not care for people who are poor or disadvantaged.

□ 1350

Mr. Chairman, I grew up as poor as anybody in this body, and I know what it means to be poor and to be hungry. I have no malice toward any person in this country, none, no malice toward anyone in this body. However, we are on the verge of a fiscal disaster in this country. There are many things that could be done at the local level and the State level, that should be done at the local and State level, but absolutely should not be done at the Federal level.

Again, my colleagues across the aisle come here and say what a shame it is that you are picking on the WIC program. Well, they took over \$500 million out of the WIC program last year, put it in a totally unrelated program and said nothing about it. We didn't come to the floor and say, you are mistreating poor and disadvantaged women and children. No comments were made about that.

Again, I think it is very unfortunate that that is how we are characterized. I believe that we have an obligation, an obligation given to us by God, to help our fellow Americans who are less fortunate than we are. But it is not our responsibility as Members of Congress to tax hardworking Americans who are working all the time just to pay their bills and survive and use that money to help other people. That is not our job. Our job is to do everything we can to create a good environment in this country for everyone to succeed, and that is the direction that I want to go. By lowering our dependency on foreign governments, we will make our country a better place to be.

As my colleagues have said over and over and over again in the debate on this bill, we are borrowing 43 cents for every dollar that we spend. We have a \$14 trillion debt. There is a huge debate about our raising the debt ceiling that is going to be facing us. Do we really want to ignore the opportunity to save \$82.5 million in a program that has no business being run out of the Federal Government and help us deal with the big issue that is facing us? That is what Congress should be dealing with. We should be dealing with the big issues. We should let these other issues be dealt with at the local and State level.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to thank my colleague from North Carolina for putting this discussion on the table, because I think that it is important for us to look at the WIC program and make sure we are doing everything as efficiently and effectively as possible and we are putting the money in the right direction.

We had a very thorough, about a 6-hour debate about WIC yesterday. It is a delicate card house that we are trying to balance with our committee mark. But I think the more sunshine we have, not just on WIC, but on other Federal feeding programs, I think the better product we are going to come up with. So she and I have had some discussions on this. We are going to continue to have discussions on it. But I wanted to say I think it is a good debate to be having, although I am not supportive of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my good friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, VIRGINIA FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding.

I just want to make a point in response to my other colleague from Georgia. I agree with him. We are bringing light to many of these programs, and I think it is very important that we do so.

I want to point out again, the WIC bureaucracy has grown three times as fast as its enrollment in the last 10 years. This is an increase of \$800 million in administrative costs. If we are not prepared at least to cut administrative costs and programs that have no business being offered at the Federal level, then we are never going to get control of our debt and our deficit. I want to encourage both my Republican and Democratic colleagues to think about this. We have got to have accountability and we have got to start cutting, especially in the area of administration.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), \$71,173,308,000, of which \$3,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013, shall be placed in reserve for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or workfare requirements as may be required by law: *Provided further*, That funds made available for Employment and Training under this heading shall remain available until expended, notwithstanding section 16(h)(1) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$1,000,000 may be used to provide nutrition education services to state agencies and Federally recognized tribes participating in the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading may be available to enter into contracts and employ staff to conduct studies, evaluations, or to conduct activities related to program integrity provided that

such activities are authorized by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.

#### COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out disaster assistance and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note); the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983; special assistance for the nuclear affected islands, as authorized by section 103(f)(2) of the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-188); and the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, as authorized by section 17(m) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, \$192,500,000, to remain available through September 30, 2013: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities donated to the program: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective with funds made available in fiscal year 2012 to support the Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, as authorized by section 4402 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, such funds shall remain available through September 30, 2013: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under section 27(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)), the Secretary may use up to 10 percent for costs associated with the distribution of commodities.

#### NUTRITION PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the Food and Nutrition Service for carrying out any domestic nutrition assistance program, \$125,000,000: *Provided*, That of the funds provided herein, \$1,500,000 shall be used for the purposes of section 4404 of Public Law 107-171, as amended by section 4401 of Public Law 110-246.

#### TITLE V

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

##### FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including not to exceed \$158,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), \$175,000,000: *Provided*, That the Service may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1737) and the foreign assistance programs of the United States Agency for International Development: *Provided further*, That funds made available for middle-income country training programs, funds made available for the Borlaug International Agricultural Science and Technology Fellowship program, and up to \$2,000,000 of the Foreign Agricultural Service appropriation solely for the purpose of offsetting fluctuations in international currency exchange rates, subject to documentation by the Foreign Agricultural Service, shall remain available until expended.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 48, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$175,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$175,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment which would cut \$175 million in FY 2012 by eliminating the Foreign Agricultural Service. This is a corporate welfare program that essentially gives handouts to private businesses that don't need taxpayer dollars in order to grow their profits. It is essential that we make significant cuts to our budget this year and focus on reducing our deficit and tackle our debt. This is an unnecessary program and a waste of money that we could use to reduce this fiscal burden.

I understand the position that my dear friend from Georgia is in. It is true that the Ryan budget is the only budget to pass either House. I supported the Ryan budget, and I supported the Republican Study Committee budget, which would have reduced even more money from this bill.

Regardless of how one voted on a particular budget, we all have an obligation to move the debate in a direction that calls for more serious spending cuts. It is critical for the economic future of our Nation. It is critical for our children and our grandchildren. It is critical in creating new jobs and having a stronger economy here in America.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE I DIRECT CREDIT AND FOOD FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the credit program of title I, Food for Peace Act (Public Law 83-480) and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, \$2,385,000, which shall be paid to the appropriation for “Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses”: *Provided*, That funds made available for the cost of agreements under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 and for title I ocean freight differential may be used interchangeably between the two accounts with prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

#### FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE II GRANTS

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Food for Peace Act (Public Law 83-480, as amended), for commodities

supplied in connection with dispositions abroad under title II of said Act, \$1,040,198,000, to remain available until expended.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1400

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment that would cut \$100 million from the billion-dollar Food for Peace program and redirect it to the rural American communities, specifically to the Rural Business Development Loan Program. This \$100 million will provide resources to rural business development loan programs. Small rural businesses and Indian tribes and community organizations can use these loans to jump-start businesses in our devastated rural communities.

I'll give you one example: the Bennett Freeze.

In the 111th Congress, we lifted the ban on this part of the Navajo Nation last year. This ban prohibited any type of improvement to homes, businesses and livelihoods. As a result of the Bennett Freeze, this area is worse than in many Third World nations.

What we are trying to do is address this need, and we are trying to provide some resources to this group of folks. We need to address the high unemployment by empowering our rural communities. Please vote in favor of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. This amendment reduces \$100 million for Food for Peace. I don't know if the gentleman from Arizona was here last night, but there was a lot of discussion about the American image abroad. Certainly, at a time when the world economy is hurting, this Food for Peace program is exactly that.

We buy American goodwill. We buy this food from American farmers. They produce it. We buy it. We ship it in American ships, and we distribute it in a food program that buys a lot of goodwill for America at a time when the conflicts of this globe are generated in cultures of poverty, where people don't have access to proper nutrition, diet.

I know from being a Peace Corps volunteer that the first thing people try to do is figure out where they're going to get enough food to eat. You can't go to school with kids because you're

hustling to get firewood or you're hustling to get water or you're hustling to find anything that will produce food for the day. A woman can't do any of the other things, maybe raising livestock, if she is just trying to hustle for food all-day long.

I mean, it just seems to me that the most basic investment in preventing violence and war is the investment in nutrition and in trying to get fed particularly those people in the poorest sectors of the world. We've got Sub-Saharan Africa, and if people don't get fed there, you're going to have migrations of millions and millions of people, and there is going to be no place to put them. Nobody is going to want a big immigration of starving people from other parts of Africa. It's going to have an impact on us. Our intelligence agencies tell us it's a security threat.

An investment in food for people at the basic level is absolutely essential. This is food raised by American farmers, paid for by American dollars and sent where it is most needed in the world. It is a very good program, and it does, indeed, trade food for peace and stability, so I think it would be unwise to cut it by \$100 million.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment following this one that would have totally eliminated funding for this program and, thus, would have presented a problem to the House. So I am going to withdraw my amendment since Dr. GOSAR has introduced his.

It is absolutely critical that we stop spending money we simply do not have. Frankly, I don't like transferring money from account to account, because I think the only transfer that we should do is the transfer into the debt reduction program so that we can reduce the Federal debt. It is absolutely critical for the economic future of this Nation.

Since I am going to withdraw my amendment following this, I wanted to get up and speak about this particular amendment and just say that I really appreciate what my good friend from California (Mr. FARR) was saying about poor people. I am a medical doctor, and I deal with problems of nutrition for my patients. I appreciate what Dr. Foxx did with her amendment about eliminating this breastfeeding program.

But you see, we are constrained by the Constitution—or should be—and Congress has gotten way, way away from the original intent of the Constitution. We cannot try to feed everybody in the world. We cannot continue to try to be a nanny state for everybody, even in this country. In the private sector, if we mobilized them, there would be plenty of dollars to take care of the needs of American citizens as well as those of the people around the

world by leaving dollars in the hands of the private sector—in people's hands, in churches, in synagogues, in mosques, and in different areas—with the Salvation Army, et cetera.

So I think we need to as a Congress start being fiscally responsible, but we have been fiscally irresponsible for many years during Democrat as well as Republican administrations, as well as under Democrat- and Republican-controlled Congresses. We just have to stop spending money.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate Mr. FARR, and I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to point out that you used the term "nanny state." Since we're government, I don't think anybody wants to be responsible for everybody, to be responsible to raise the whole society; but I do think that this help that you give people from the Federal Government and from local and State governments is absolutely essential.

When you don't have that infrastructure of social services and needs there, I'll tell you what happens—people still have those problems. Only they don't have a place to go get them. So do you know what they do? They knock on your door. In America, we don't have to open our door day after day, with somebody holding a baby, as I saw in the Peace Corps. There were people all the time with dead babies, infants. There were people who were begging for money to bury them properly or there were people asking you for extra food after you finished your meal. They know what time you eat, and ask, Can you give your leftovers to us?

We don't have that in America because we have an infrastructure that takes care of people. I think, if you totally wipe that out and say, well, leave it to charity, charity is just voluntary. It doesn't always work. When the markets crash, the charity isn't there. Poverty is still there. The need is still there. You saw it as a doctor, and you know you've serviced people who couldn't pay their bills; but you do have Medicare reimbursements and other kinds of Medicare reimbursements so that you can, even if they can't pay their bills, get some form of payment. If it were all left up to voluntary, the doctors would have to serve people who just have no money. I don't think all the poor people in America would be taken care of.

So we do have to concern ourselves with how much care and spending we do, but at the same time, don't wipe out the programs that are essentially the life support systems of a society that is as rich as America. We can afford to take care of the people most vulnerable, whether they are aging or infants, and I think a lot of the discussion here has been about trying to delete the programs that help people at their most vulnerable stages of life.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate your comments.

But, you see, when I was sworn into the Marine Corps and when I was sworn into Congress—now three times—I swore to uphold the Constitution. I believe in this document as our Founding Fathers meant it, which means very limited government. In fact, we are destroying the very thing that has made this country so great, so powerful, so rich as a Nation, which is constitutionally limited government, the free enterprise system, private property rights, personal responsibility, the rule of law, and morality.

It is absolutely critical, if we are going to have a bright, shining star of liberty over the heads of America, that we rebuild those foundational principles. That's what I'm fighting for and will continue to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in opposition to a previous amendment, to the Gosar amendment, which would eliminate the Food for Peace program and transfer it to rural development.

I also was going to rise in opposition to the gentleman from Georgia's amendment, which also goes after Food for Peace. I am glad he is withdrawing it, but I find it astonishing that there are so many on the other side who are attacking programs that I think are so vital to our national security.

Mr. GOSAR's amendment would tell farmers that we will take away from them \$1 billion in U.S. purchases of their crops so that we can borrow money in the form of loans for other purposes. That's essentially what he is proposing. Does that make sense to anyone?

So we tell U.S. farmers who have been selling wheat, rice, soybeans, vegetable oil, beans, peas, lentils, and other commodities to the U.S. Government that this market is closed to them. So long. Goodbye. Go borrow money. Go into debt. Take out a loan to develop the rural economy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I support the Rural Development program, and I obviously support the Food for Peace program. Both of them directly benefit American farmers. Mr. GOSAR himself said Food for Peace title II (P.L. 480) merits support.

□ 1410

Well, let's talk about why. It supports U.S. farmers, millers, freight rail, truck, and shipping. Food aid provided by USAID is a lifesaving measure for 11 million to 16 million vulnerable people overseas. Our largest emergency food aid programs include Darfur and southern Sudan, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Haiti, and Ethiopia. U.S. food aid not only helps people survive; it supports

U.S. national security interests. It promotes stability and goodwill, especially in Libya, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Our emergency and humanitarian food aid sends the clear message to desperate people in need that the American people care. The Gosar amendment sends the opposite message—that the American people don't care at all; go ahead and starve.

We need to support Food for Peace, and we need to oppose that amendment. But we also need to oppose amendments that gut essential food and nutrition programs for poor people not only here in the United States but around the world. This notion that somehow when we support programs like Food for Peace, that it's just helping a bunch of foreigners overseas, is just wrongheaded. It is American farmers that produce much of the food that goes to support the hungry around the world. It is American farmers that are so important in our battle against terrorism because, quite frankly, I think these programs, as Secretary Gates has said, do more to enhance our national security than anything else.

I urge my colleagues who are coming to the floor with amendments to gut these programs, to stop it. Enough. These are essential programs. They help people who are helpless overseas but also help support our economy here in the United States and help our U.S. farmers.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Number one, we have actually reduced this account 31 percent. Again, as I have said many times, passing an appropriation bill that is building a card house, there's a delicate balance. I have got my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, who believes that we've cut too much. I've got my friend, Dr. BROUN, who believes we haven't cut enough. And so we're trying to move this legislation.

I wanted to talk a little bit about PL-480 and say a couple of things. Number one, there is a national security interest in it. This is not about international charity alone. We do have an interest. America needs to be engaged around the world. When there is a natural disaster or manmade disaster, if we're not there, who will be there? And this is very important. My friend Mr. DICKS is here, former chairman of the HAC-D Committee, and knows that in terms of the national defense, we have soldiers right now as I speak in 60 different countries around the globe. Now, they are engaged for a reason. It's not a job-creation program. They're keeping an eye on national security interests.

If you travel in Africa or travel in South America right now, you'll see a new player that was not there 10 years ago, and that is the country of China.

China is not necessarily an immediate threat to us, but it is a concern to us. China is rising as a military force and certainly as an economic source, and they are engaged all over the globe. Often our international programs, including food programs, keep us engaged and gives us an opportunity to have some doors open which we would not ordinarily have.

America provides 57 percent of the food aid in the world, followed by the EU at 27 percent and Japan at 6 percent. Right now, China is not a major player. The oil-rich Middle East countries certainly aren't major players. But it is about engagement. And it's interesting that we have a balance between developmental aid and emergency aid. Because if there is a Haitian disaster, we're the first on the ground trying to get food to the people. But we need to also be there with developmental aid to make sure that these countries are independent and that these countries do know how to grow their own food and have their own resources.

So I just want to emphasize again that this program has been trimmed already 31 percent, and it seems to me the balance that will get this bill over to the Senate so that we can negotiate further on it. We are in many, many different countries around the world.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, Dr. GOSAR.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, my friend.

I would like to reiterate that there is an issue that we also have to take care of folks at home. For example, I brought up the Navajo Nation in the Bennett Freeze area. This is a treaty responsibility of the United States in which we forbade different groups from even raising to take care of a window pane or create economic certainty. We have to take care of our own, or we'll not be able to help anybody across the world. And that's why I actually rise in support of my amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I do want to point out some of the things that this program is doing in Pakistan, Haiti, the Sudan, and Afghanistan. And I will submit that for the RECORD.

#### P.L. 480 TITLE II

##### History

For more than 50 years, the United States Government has played a lead role in meeting emergency humanitarian food needs through P.L. 480 Title II (Title II). Some of the first U.S. food assistance resources assisted the war-devastated economies of Europe. As these economies regained their strength they began to pay for American farm commodities. President Eisenhower signed P.L. 480 Title II into law in 1954 and it was later renamed the "Food for Peace" Act.

##### Current Need and Impact of Cuts

Currently, overall U.S. funding to WFP feeds on average 35 million people. A cut of Title II to \$1,040,198, as marked-up by the House Agricultural Appropriations subcommittee, would mean that 15 million people—primarily women and children—suffering from hunger as a result of conflict and natural disasters would lose access to life saving

food. These cuts would significantly reduce the United States' ability to address instability in volatile countries and decrease its capacity to respond quickly to the needs of hungry people affected by natural disaster or armed conflict.

#### Title II Assists People Affected by Natural Disasters

##### PAKISTAN

In July 2010, floods ravaged Pakistan, affecting millions. WFP was able to reach people quickly and began to distribute food just days after the record monsoon rains began. The first food to reach the affected population was funded by U.S. Food for Peace. The first helicopters that lifted food to remote valleys in Swat and the northern regions were also carrying U.S. food. Within the first month, WFP was able to reach approximately 3 million people and then scaled up very quickly to 7 million. Life-saving support was then followed by early recovery activities which included school feeding and nutrition support.

Story from the field: Razia Bibi and her family were badly hit in the floods that devastated Pakistan last summer. Razia lives in a little village called Chandia in central Pakistan. She and her family lived on an embankment for a month last summer as monsoon flooding flattened all the homes in her community. As floodwaters subsided in September, they started to pick up the pieces of their lives. Monthly food rations from WFP have kept them going while they have rebuilt their house and life has slowly returned to normality. Razia and her husband sold their three goats, their last major assets, to rebuild their house using high-quality bricks that would be more resistant in case of another flood. In December 2010, Razia picked up the family's last food ration. Now that her husband is back at work and they have a house, she and her family are able to support themselves. Their six children are back at school and because of food assistance they were able to get back on their feet.

##### HAITI

In Haiti, in the immediate aftermath of the January 12th earthquake, WFP began providing assistance within 24 hours and swiftly organized general food distributions. Only six weeks after the quake, WFP assistance, through partners such as World Vision, was reaching more than 4 million people, 35 percent of which was from the U.S. government. In the following months, WFP also put in place safety net interventions—including school feeding and nutrition. Following the large general distribution, school feeding was the quickest safety net intervention to scale up, reaching over 500,000 school children. At the request of the Government, WFP then scaled up to assist 1 million children. In October, a take-home ration was also given to family members to get children back in school, especially those who had dropped out after the earthquake. WFP also launched a blanket supplementary feeding program to all children five years of age and under and pregnant/lactating women.

Story from the field: When the earthquake struck Haiti in January of 2010 Cassandre Chery and her family were just leaving their home. A piece of concrete fell and broke her foot but otherwise they were uninjured. Her home, however, was badly damaged. "It's difficult to find work now," said Cassandre who used to be a beautician. Her husband also has trouble finding work. Their two girls, who live with them in a tent in Port-au-Prince, were forced to go hungry some days. But now Cassandre is back to work and she is rebuilding her country with a food for work project with World Vision and WFP. She receives food and cash to work clearing rubble from

roads and drainage channels. “This works means a lot to me,” she said. “It has helped me pay school fees and feed my two daughters.”

Story from the field: At Sister Mary Bernadette’s primary school in Port-au-Prince, students began gathering after the earthquake, though classes had not yet resumed. Most had lost their homes, and a family member or friend. They came in search of support and in search of something familiar. As plans came together to begin makeshift lessons, WFP started distributing daily meals to Sister Mary Bernadette’s students. “They’d simply be too weak to study if they weren’t able to eat something at school,” she says. “It’s important for them to have a meal here. Most of them come from very poor families.” Sister Mary Bernadette says that the food “helps [them] to study and stay focused in class. When they don’t eat, they don’t hear, they don’t listen, they don’t see.” A year after the earthquake, things in her school are improving. During the summer break, crews tore down the damaged building and workers are now putting the final touches to temporary classrooms. The students seem to be recovering too, said the school principal. “Some of them are still struggling though. When you lose a member of your family, your mother or your father, you just can’t forget. But we do our best to help them.”

Title II Assists Those Affected by Conflict and Helps Restore and Maintain Stability in Volatile Regions

SUDAN

WFP assistance in Sudan, reaching 6.7 million people, has been a critical stabilizing factor since the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed in 2005. In 2010, nearly half of assistance to WFP in Sudan was generously provided by the U.S. government. This assistance has provided stability throughout the South Sudan referendum process. Readiness, contingency measures and pre-positioning, has allowed WFP to respond quickly to any situation, including the current population displacements in Abyei (an area between south Sudan and Sudan). WFP’s strategic engagement for post-referendum South Sudan is vital for ensuring a smooth transition. WFP’s engagement will support the restoration of sustainable assets for the communities, infrastructure (feeder roads), safety nets (school feeding, seed protection, nutrition), strategic food reserve, Government capacity in food security analysis, and support to smallholder farmers through purchase-for-progress.

Story from the field: Food assistance has played a critical role in southern Sudan over the last few years and has been key in supporting families returning home. Grace Lado, a 25 year old mother of 2, fled fighting in Juba in southern Sudan when she was only 7 years old. When her family decided to move back a WFP food ration made it possible. In spite of the deteriorating security situation, WFP is currently feeding some 530,000 people across southern Sudan. In addition to food assistance WFP is also helping to repair roads and assist farmers across the region so that those the country can get on a path to sustainable growth. Until then, however, these lifesaving food rations are helping people to build a stable and secure foundation in a country that is hopeful for a brighter future.

AFGHANISTAN

In 2010, the U.S. government supplied 36 percent of the assistance to WFP in Afghanistan, enabling WFP to assist 7 million people (or 25 percent of the population) and, through its strategic engagement, helps deploy an effective system of safety net inter-

ventions and build sustainable assets for the communities through food-for-education, food-for-work, and food-for-training.

Story from the field: When Taliban forces arrived in their village Jamila’s husband lost both his legs during the fighting. Jamila’s family was forced to sell their farmland to pay for his treatment and they suddenly found themselves unable to feed their four children. “I will never forget the day I realized we had nothing to eat,” Jamila said. Her husband’s family refused to provide assistance and told her to marry off her teenage daughters in order to get dowry money. Jamila’s husband, frustrated, depressed and hungry, often took his anger out on her. All of that changed, however, when Jamila began a training program with WFP that provided her with a new set of skills while her family received food rations. Now Jamila is able to support her family by selling children’s clothes to a local shop. “Now that I have a skill and am providing for my family, all the members of my family respect me,” she says. By providing food aid while Jamila received training she was able to stave off hunger while she built a new life for her family.

Story from the field: For years the people of Dega Payan had to travel five hours on foot or by donkey to the nearest medical clinic. Travel by car was impossible as there were no roads leading to their remote village in one of Afghanistan’s poorest provinces (Badakhshan) which has high level of under-nutrition and food insecurity. Now, as a result of a WFP program that employed local villagers to build a road while providing their families with much needed food assistance, a road has been completed connecting Dega Payan to the larger town of Ziraki, where there is a clinic. This has made the village accessible by road and allows local farmers to get their crops to markets more easily and allows traders to bring supplies into the village that were not available before.

McGOVERN-DOLE INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL MEALS PROGRAM BACKGROUND

Approximately 2.7 million children receive McGovern/Dole school meals through WFP, which helps them fight short-term hunger, increase their concentration/performance in school, encourages parents to send them to school, and helps girls to get an education. A better educated girl will make more informed choices and will grow up to raise a more food secure family. Promoting girls education is crucial in countries where there are serious gender disparities. Every \$50 cut in the program would deny a child access to food for a whole school year. Without a daily meal, many poor children would not attend class with long-term ramifications for the child, the community and the country.

Story from the field: In Afghanistan WFP hands out take-home rations of vegetable oil to approximately 600,000 girls (in addition to the on-site meals) as an incentive for the parents to send their girls to school. In a school in Laghman Province, one of the teachers told WFP “There are more girls coming to school now because of the food. Before I had six classes, now I have twelve.” In the same region, girls’ enrolment increased by 40 percent by end of 2008 from the baseline data 2 years earlier, and attendance rate for girls improved by 30 percent from baseline. Families realize that girls are bringing income by going to school. A girl at the same school queuing for her oil ration said “We are so happy to get this oil. We are poor and our family is happy with us since we can bring something of value to our homes”.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$940,198,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$940,198,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, as I spoke on the previous amendment, we just don’t have the money. It’s very altruistic of my friends on both sides to want to feed people all over the world. I very much would like to be able to do so, but we can’t feed our people here at home. We’ve got a high jobless rate. We just have to simply stop spending money that we don’t have. And this would just zero out the balance of the funds if my friend from Arizona’s amendment is indeed passed into this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as we look at where we’re going as a Nation, we’ve got to be focusing on jobs and the economy. We have to leave dollars in the hands of businesses, particularly small businesses. Leave the dollars in the hands of individuals so that they can take care of their own needs and their own communities instead of building a bigger and bigger Federal program to try to take care of everybody’s needs all over the world.

We just simply do not have the money. And it just has to stop. And it’s time to stop right now. We’re headed toward an economic cliff in this Nation. And it may be very soon where we’re going to be off that cliff, where everybody in this country except for the extremely wealthy are going to be forced into just tremendous poverty.

We have a potential of having riots in the streets and bloodletting in this country because of the great debt and spending that’s going on. We’re destroying jobs. We’re destroying our economy. And it just must stop. The sooner, the better. My amendment would simply zero out the rest of the funds in this program. I think it’s critical for us just to stop spending money.

USDA	State Department		
	Voting practices in the UN, 2010		
Programmed food aid, 2010	Votes only (%)	Overall (%)	Important (%)
2010—received food aid			
Algeria .....	30.4	81.7	16.7

USDA	State Department		
Programmed food aid, 2010	Voting practices in the UN, 2010		
2010—received food aid	Votes only (%)	Overall (%)	Important (%)
Angola .....	30.6	81.9	33.3
Burkina Faso .....	32.3	82.7	25.0
Burundi .....	25.0	79.3	77.8
Cameroon .....	44.7	88.9	60.0
Central African Rep. ...	37.7	84.1	66.7
Chad .....	0.0	66.7	0.0
Congo, Democratic Rep. of .....	46.2	87.2	75.0
Congo, Republic of .....	37.9	84.3	42.9
Djibouti .....	33.8	82.8	40.0
Ethiopia .....	32.8	83.2	44.4
Gambia .....	31.3	82.0	40.0
Guinea-Bissau .....	31.3	82.2	40.0
Kenya .....	31.7	83.0	57.1
Liberia .....	35.9	83.9	54.5
Madagascar .....	32.3	82.5	44.4
Malawi .....	35.3	83.2	50.0
Mali .....	30.8	82.4	30.0
Mauritania .....	32.4	82.4	30.0
Mozambique .....	27.9	81.1	33.3
Niger .....	32.8	83.1	33.3
Rwanda .....	50.0	86.9	57.1
Senegal .....	31.8	82.7	33.3
Sierra Leone .....	38.6	83.6	55.6
Somalia .....	28.8	80.7	27.3
Sudan .....	31.4	81.8	30.8
Tanzania .....	n/a	n/a	n/a
Uganda .....	8.6	76.3	60.0
Zambia .....	33.3	82.9	44.4
Zimbabwe .....	30.4	81.3	30.8
Afghanistan .....	34.3	82.4	46.2
Bangladesh .....	32.9	82.2	77.8
Cambodia .....	30.9	81.9	25.0
India .....	25.4	82.6	14.3
Laos .....	27.4	81.6	22.2
Nepal .....	35.8	83.5	33.3
Pakistan .....	21.3	81.2	22.2
Philippines .....	31.3	82.7	33.3
Sri Lanka .....	31.9	82.1	25.0
Tajikistan .....	30.0	82.1	30.0
Yemen .....	33.3	82.6	40.0
Colombia .....	36.1	84.7	50.0
Dominican Republic ...	36.4	83.4	36.4
Ecuador .....	32.4	82.4	30.0
Guatemala .....	37.9	84.2	62.5
Haiti .....	31.8	82.6	30.0
Honduras .....	63.4	83.6	60.0
Nicaragua .....	30.4	81.7	15.2

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. FARR. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Again, I don't know how many times we have to reiterate that these cuts, squeezes, and trims hurt the most vulnerable people in America and abroad. My good friend talked about a fiscal disaster that we are having in America and then just goes amendment after amendment attacking the people that are most vulnerable. This one just wipes out the entire program.

I wish the Member had been here to watch what happened in the early part of this decade when a partnership with the rich was created in this Congress to help in every tax way possible, in every expenditure way possible, in building up the war machine to respond to Iraq and Afghanistan. The rich got richer. The corporations that built all the equipment for our men and women in uniform got a lot of profits. We did that by putting it all on the credit card of the American taxpayer. We just charged it up. Yes, we ran up an incredible deficit.

□ 1420

The gentleman fails to look at the other side of the coin. He talked about the fact he had been in the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps was also put on that tax credit card. The uniform, the free medical service he got, the food that he ate while he was a Marine,

all those things, thank God, we paid for. But then to say, okay, we're going to now reduce this fiscal disaster by just attacking the most vulnerable people in the world and wiping out the Food for Peace program.

Where are we? Where is the image of America? Where is that heart and soul? Where is that feeling of people that love our country because of the hand-outs we do give at a time of need? We're there to respond to disasters. And we can't just be that responder that says, okay, we're going to respond with our war machine. We've got to respond with our heart and our soul and the character of American human beings, which is very giving and very compassionate. To wipe out the Food for Peace program is not a wise thing to do.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I would just say to the Chair and to the author of the amendment, who's a doctor, a medical doctor, remember the Hippocratic oath: Do no harm.

This amendment, if it is enacted, will deny millions of people getting food. Millions of children's lives have been saved because of this program and I hope the Broun amendment will be defeated.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. How much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SCHOCK). The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. DICKS. I resent the fact that you accuse me of wanting to do harm, because I do not—

Mr. DICKS. You don't think your amendment will do harm, sir?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. No, sir. Actually, it will do good.

The thing is, we come to the crux of the problem here in that some people in this body believe that the Federal Government ought to take care of everybody in the world, and I would love to be able to do that. There's no end of good things that can be done all over this world. But for you to accuse me of wanting to do harm to people, I resent that.

Mr. DICKS. It's your amendment, sir. I didn't get up here and offer an amendment that would cut funding.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Sir, I have the time.

I do resent the fact that you accuse me of wanting to do harm. Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if this comes to a point of order of taking down the gentleman's words, but I bring forth a point of order.

Mr. FARR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, in finishing, I would just like to say, there is some inconsistency and insincerity here in stating what

you did as a profession and then cutting these programs, because these go to the children that we think the medical profession so much appreciates trying to care for. I mean, if you can't feed children, if you can't feed women, and you can't feed infants, no matter where in the world they are, problems are going to occur. Big, serious problems. That is not fiscal conservative. That is just not very intelligent.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring a point of order about the gentleman's accusations that I want to do harm. I believe this meets the criteria of taking down his words, and I would like a ruling from the Chair regarding that.

The Acting CHAIR. All Members will suspend.

The Clerk will report the words.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The demand is withdrawn.

Mr. DICKS. I will revise my words and make sure that it will not be an insult to the gentleman.

I appreciate him withdrawing his point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington may revise his remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very, very, very strong opposition to this amendment gutting the Food for Peace program. Food for peace.

I find it somewhat ironic that we have people who oppose food for peace but support weapons for war without giving it a second thought. The fact of the matter is that this amendment would do great harm to some of the most helpless people in the world. I believe very, very strongly on a bipartisan basis that this amendment should be defeated.

The Food for Peace program has saved the lives of millions and millions of people. It is a good program. It is something we should be proud of in this country, and on a bipartisan basis, I believe, we are proud of the Food for Peace program. I think we need a big bipartisan vote to defeat this amendment.

I appreciated the chairman's remarks earlier, and I thank him for his comments on this issue.

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. We've already cut this program by 38 percent below the President's budget request and 31 percent below last year. That is a major cut in this program. To go any further, I think, would be a big mistake.



I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman. I would just say that, yes, we need to get serious about the deficit and we need to find ways to bring this deficit down. But taking food out of the mouths of children is not the way to do this.

I can go through a litany of things that deserve to be cut, from some of the subsidies that we provide some of the big agricultural businesses to the subsidization of the oil companies to some of the tax breaks for the Donald Trumps of the world. I would rather start there. But to take, to denigrate this program, I think, is wrong. This is something we should be proud of, and, in a bipartisan way, we should be proud of this. Presidents, both Republican and Democratic, have supported this program, and this is vital to the survival of so many people around the world.

Again, I would reiterate what Secretary Gates said. These programs, these developmental programs, are important to our national security. I'm going to tell you, they do more to help improve our image and protect our security around the world than a lot of these other programs that we have that export military hardware all around the world. This is important. This is real. This saves lives.

I would urge my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to soundly reject this amendment and let us support food for peace. Let us support food programs for the poor. That's who we are. That reflects well on this country. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. EMERSON. I have been sitting back listening to all of the discussion here on a subject that is near and dear to my heart, and it has been near and dear to our family since the very first time my late husband came back from Ethiopia having sobbed, as he told me, a story about a child from Ethiopia who died in his arms.

□ 1430

Now, I will say that there's been an awful lot of rhetoric on this, and I think that the chairman, in spite of the fact that I don't like the number, I don't like the numbers that we've been given, the chairman, who also has traveled to Africa and has seen up close and personal how these programs really do make a difference for those of us who live here in the United States, how important these programs are for our national security, as Mr. MCGOVERN said and Mr. DICKS, and also how important it is that America, which is still the richest country in the world in spite of our financial difficulties, has respect and wants to help others because we ourselves have been so well blessed.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I want to thank my col-

leagues from the other side and thank Mr. KINGSTON as well and hope that as we proceed through the process that we might be able to find some common ground, perhaps get a little bit more assistance for these vital programs, but let's try to keep our emotions down a little bit because everybody feels very strongly, but yet our common goal is to lift this country up, and by helping others, we do that.

I yield back the balance of time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT  
(LOANS) CREDIT GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the Commodity Credit Corporation's export guarantee program, GSM 102 and GSM 103, \$6,820,000; to cover common overhead expenses as permitted by section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and in conformity with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of which \$6,465,000 shall be paid to the appropriation for "Foreign Agricultural Service, Salaries and Expenses", and of which \$355,000 shall be paid to the appropriation for "Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses".

MCGOVERN-DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR  
EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM  
GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o-1), \$180,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to provide the services, facilities, and authorities for the purpose of implementing such section, subject to reimbursement from amounts provided herein.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF  
GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 50, line 18, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$180,000,000)".

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$180,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment which would zero out the McGovern-Dole program and save taxpayers \$180 million in the coming fiscal year. We simply cannot continue to dole out money that we simply don't have, particularly when we're experiencing such a huge economic crisis and economic emergency here at home.

It's important to make serious cuts wherever and whenever we can, and this funding is not tied to a specific national security interest. So we can afford to do without it. I think we should do without it, but I'm offering my amendment, and I hope it passes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a bad amendment. It eliminates funding for one of the U.S. signature programs to reduce child hunger in the world. I helped establish the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food For Education Program, first as a pilot project in 2000, and then as a permanent program in the 2002 farm bill. It has always had strong bipartisan support, including from my colleague and my friend JO ANN EMERSON and then-Congressmen, now-Senators JOHN THUNE and JERRY MORAN.

McGovern-Dole has one basic goal: provide at least one nutritious meal to some of the world's most vulnerable children in a school setting. It has reduced the incidence of hunger among school-age children. It has increased school enrollment and attendance. It has increased the support of families and communities for education, especially for girls.

McGovern-Dole is a proven success. Instead of cutting its funding, let alone eliminating it, we should be scaling it up. The cuts to McGovern-Dole already in the bill would end school meals for more than 400,000 children. Eliminating the funding would literally take the food out of the mouths of over 5 million of the world's most vulnerable children.

Mr. Chairman, it's bad enough to ignore hungry children. It's even worse to give a hungry child a meal, to give their parents hope for a better future, and then take it away. These are not just numbers in a bill. These are real living, breathing human beings, real children who are in school, many for the very first time because the U.S. is working with local communities to advance education and nutrition.

Now, I've visited some of these programs around the world. I respectfully suggest to those who want to eliminate them to first go and see with their own eyes what they are doing on the ground, look these children, their parents, their teachers, their community leaders in the eye, and make sure you want to tell them you don't care if they go hungry or get a chance to go to school.

In Colombia, I visited a program in Soacha, on the outskirts of Bogota. On barren hillsides, surrounded by shanties housing thousands of internally displaced families, children were receiving a school breakfast and lunch. Mothers and grandmothers were training as cooks, preparing the meals. Clearly visible in the cafeteria were

USAID bags of grains, beans, and lentils.

One mother came up to me and said, Please thank the American people when you go back home. I couldn't feed my children. I couldn't send them to school. I was afraid my son—who was 11 years old—was going to join the paramilitaries or the guerrillas just to get food. Now my son is getting fed, and he's staying in school. Please tell the American people thank you.

In Nairobi, Kenya, in the largest slum in the world, I went to a McGovern-Dole breakfast and lunch program. I was amazed by the students' energy and achievements. The school principal showed me how they store and prepare the U.S. commodities that feed her students and how all the students know that this is a program from the people of the United States of America.

I ate a cereal mush made from yellow peas, grown by American farmers, in a room full of children. The kids dug into this food like it was manna from heaven. One little boy would take a bite and then scoop a small amount out of his bowl and put it into his pockets. He was taking food home to his younger siblings who don't get anything to eat at all.

Outside of Nairobi is Masai country and a school for girls where McGovern-Dole provides a hot lunch. I helped cook and serve the meal of U.S. bulgur wheat and locally grown vegetables. One student told me how grateful she was to go to school and eat every day.

She grew up in a village over a hundred miles away. When she was 12, her father told her that she had to marry a much older man. She refused. Her father ordered her to go to her uncle's house, get his machete, and bring it back to him. She knew that her father was going to kill her. She ran away, walking alone for days, because she had heard of this school. She was then 15, healthy, well-fed, and at the top of her class. I knew I was talking to someone who could be president someday. In the very best way, this young woman will never forget us.

And in the very worst way, when we take food away from children, families, and schools, those communities will never forget us either. They won't forget that we took away their children's future. I wouldn't forget it if it were my child. Would you?

Mr. Chairman, there are many ways to advance U.S. national security and economic interests abroad. Education and child nutrition are very much at the top of that list. It is important that we support the McGovern-Dole program. This has enjoyed incredible bipartisan support, and I'm going to tell you this does more to enhance our national security than sending weapons to countries all over the world.

The people who benefit from this program know it comes from the people of the United States of America. This is a good program. Support the McGovern-Dole program. Reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. EMERSON. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. EMERSON. I'm not going to take the entire 5 minutes. I do want to say a couple of things.

Number one, I totally associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Massachusetts, and it is quite true that taking away the program funding would, in fact, literally take food out of the mouths of 5 million hungry, hungry children.

I also want to add, because I know that people probably don't understand this if you haven't been working with this program, is that countries actually graduate from this program. This is not an ongoing effort in every single country, whether Colombia might have graduated, Nicaragua, and other countries.

But, you know, with so many threats against our Nation, I just think it's important to share America's bounty with hungry children in other places and in critical places around the world so that we can help America feed their hungry bodies out of goodness.

□ 1440

And it really is something that the entire Defense Department—you ask any Army officer or any member of the armed services, when they are in areas where these children's lives are being changed by a bowl of mush, as Mr. MCGOVERN said, it makes a huge difference. It makes them able to go to school. It makes little girls have the only opportunity they will ever get for any kind of education, and it is absolutely ridiculous that people don't understand how important this is for the security of our country.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I just want to thank the gentlewoman for her comments and to thank her for her leadership not only on this issue but on some of the other issues to help hungry children around the world.

I just want to also commend her for making the point that in the McGovern-Dole program, there are provisions that require that countries graduate out of the program. So this is not a permanent U.S. handout, if you will. This is some support to help get established school feeding programs that will, one, get more kids in school; and two, give kids a nutritious meal.

Mrs. EMERSON. And if I could reclaim my time, the countries actually take this program over. This is a jump-start and one that, you know, for no other reason, little girls would never go to school. And to me, it's just shocking. We take these things for granted in this country. But it sets a very, very good example and gives these children and their families an opportunity to do more for themselves with just a wee bit of help from us.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I also want to say that this program is named after George McGovern and Robert Dole. So by the very naming of this program, it shows the bipartisanship that has been involved in forming this program from the very beginning. I think we all should be proud of that in this Congress.

Mrs. EMERSON. And we should be. Elizabeth Dole took over for Bob after he left the Senate. And this was a very important issue for her, but it has always been one that is bipartisan and one that helps lift other people up because we really do have so much here.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. FARR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I just want to make one short comment. What happens in this program is that we contract with countries to create these incentives to get kids to go to school. And you have heard the incredible stories that the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman JIM MCGOVERN, just gave us on his experiences in visiting these countries.

It's not only that these contracts are made with countries so they have to put something into it, but they also have a way of working themselves out. So it's not one of those, going back to Congressman BROUN's comment earlier about Nannygate—this is a “work yourself out of a program.” You can get off the program by having it work. And then you can move the moneys to another country. So I think it's an outstanding program and worth keeping and certainly this cut would ruin it all.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. DELAURO. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this shortsighted and I believe dangerous amendment that will increase suffering and misery all around the world and put American men and women in danger. And my colleagues have addressed that issue as well.

The appropriations legislation before us is already remarkably stingy with regards to international food aid. It cuts the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program by 10 percent below the President's request and Food for Peace by an astonishing \$650 million. It is a 38 percent reduction. Now Mr. BROUN proposes to zero out McGovern-Dole entirely. This is a program that, as you can tell by its name, has been a hallmark of bipartisan leadership for over a decade now. It is a linchpin in our diplomatic efforts in developing nations.

Make no mistake. Cutting McGovern-Dole endangers our national security.

Zeroing out this program, as this amendment calls for, would needlessly put the safety and the security of American families at risk.

For the first time in history, over 1 billion people—one in six—are undernourished worldwide. Every 6 seconds, a child dies because of hunger and related causes. And this hunger forces people into desperate acts and dangerous pacts. Famine and starvation create the conditions for militant extremism, the very extremism our troops fight in Afghanistan and around the world.

And so McGovern-Dole, and the international food aid it provides, is a crucial front in our efforts to combat global terror. We fight hunger and poverty, and we undercut the recruiting base of those who would threaten us. As former National Security Adviser Sandy Berger wrote in *The Los Angeles Times*, “Ensuring that no child goes to school hungry is the single greatest investment we can make in building prosperous, healthy, and stable societies.”

McGovern-Dole is that investment, and it works. Operating in 28 countries around the world, including Afghanistan and Pakistan, McGovern-Dole provides at least one nutritious meal each day to vulnerable children in schools. It has shown demonstrated success in both reducing hunger and increasing school enrollment and attendance, especially, as my colleagues pointed out, for girls. Otherwise, little girls in these countries don’t get any education, and they don’t get any food.

Last month, the GAO released a report on McGovern-Dole, and it called for strengthening monitoring by the USDA, accelerating the timeframe of reporting. It did not, however, call into question any of the objectives of the program. This program works. Since becoming a permanent program in the 2002 farm bill, it has reduced hunger and violence, increased education and nutrition, and has become a vital element in our international diplomacy. Zeroing out the program, as this amendment demands, would not only destroy all these many benefits for America and the developing world, it would mean 5 million kids will go hungry again, 5 million children. And yet, even as this amendment threatens to force millions into starvation, somehow the majority’s budget still finds money for oil company subsidies and tax breaks for millionaires.

Cutting this funding is shortsighted in the extreme. McGovern-Dole works. It works for America. It works for developing nations around the world. It moves children from starvation to education. And it undercuts the recruiting ability of those who would do America harm.

I urge my colleagues, stand with our troops. Stand against hunger worldwide and oppose this disastrous amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE VI

#### RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

#### FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration, including hire and purchase of passenger motor vehicles; for payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92-313 for programs and activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary’s certificate, not to exceed \$25,000; and notwithstanding section 521 of Public Law 107-188; \$3,654,148,000: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$856,041,000 shall be derived from prescription drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379h, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended, and shall not include any fees pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379h(a)(2) and (a)(3) assessed for fiscal year 2013 but collected in fiscal year 2012; \$67,118,000 shall be derived from medical device user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; \$21,768,000 shall be derived from animal drug user fees authorized by section 740 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-12), and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; \$5,706,000 shall be derived from animal generic drug user fees authorized by section 741 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379j-21), and shall be credited to this account and shall remain available until expended; and \$477,000,000 shall be derived from tobacco product user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 387s and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; \$12,364,000 shall be derived from food and feed recall fees authorized by section 743 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Public Law 75-717), as amended by the Food Safety Modernization Act (Public Law 111-353), and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; \$14,700,000 shall be derived from food inspection fees authorized by section 743 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Public Law 75-717), as amended by the Food Safety Modernization Act (Public Law 111-353), and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; and \$36,000,000 shall be derived from voluntary qualified importer program fees authorized by section 743 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Public Law 75-717), as amended by the Food Safety Modernization Act (Public Law 111-353), and shall be credited to this account and remain available until ex-

ended: *Provided further*, That fees derived from prescription drug, medical device, animal drug, animal generic drug, and tobacco product assessments for fiscal year 2012 received during fiscal year 2012, including any such fees assessed prior to fiscal year 2012 but credited for fiscal year 2012, shall be subject to the fiscal year 2012 limitations: *Provided further*, That in addition and notwithstanding any other provision under this heading, amounts collected for prescription drug user fees that exceed the fiscal year 2012 limitation are appropriated and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated: (1) \$799,820,000 shall be for the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (2) \$1,031,205,000 shall be for the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (3) \$327,651,000 shall be for the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (4) \$157,874,000 shall be for the Center for Veterinary Medicine and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (5) \$321,171,000 shall be for the Center for Devices and Radiological Health and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (6) \$51,461,000 shall be for the National Center for Toxicological Research; (7) \$454,751,000 shall be for the Center for Tobacco Products and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (8) not to exceed \$124,273,000 shall be for Rent and Related activities, of which \$37,073,000 is for White Oak Consolidation, other than the amounts paid to the General Services Administration for rent; (9) not to exceed \$177,130,000 shall be for payments to the General Services Administration for rent; and (10) \$208,812,000 shall be for other activities, including the Office of the Commissioner; the Office of Foods; the Office of the Chief Scientist; the Office of Policy, Planning and Budget; the Office of International Programs; the Office of Administration; and central services for these offices: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$25,000 of this amount shall be for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Commissioner: *Provided further*, That funds may be transferred from one specified activity to another with the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

In addition, mammography user fees authorized by 42 U.S.C. 263b, export certification user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 381, and priority review user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 360n may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 51, line 18, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$392,000,000)”.

Page 52, line 11, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$392,000,000)”.

Page 54, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$392,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$392,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, let me just briefly say, this is a very simple amendment. It takes the Center for Tobacco Products back to the 2009 level. Now all of you should realize, this agency never existed in 2006. There have been prodigious increases in this center. We are taking the funding for this Center for Tobacco Products back to the 2009 level.

Now under the President's plan, the budget for the FDA's Center for Tobacco Products has simply exploded. The administration's budget justification to Congress states, "FDA is experiencing an unprecedented and dramatic surge in staffing and facility needs that will cause FDA facility requirements to exceed the scope of the 2009 master plan."

□ 1450

I understand that. The FDA is expanding, does good work. I'm not criticizing it.

But one area of the FDA's budget that is growing way too fast under this administration's budget is the brand-new Center for Tobacco Products. Again, this agency, this center did not exist in 2006.

In the FY 2012 Agriculture appropriations legislation reported by the committee, it continues the trend of major discretionary spending reduction sought by the Republican majority. This same fiscal restraint should be applied to the Center for Tobacco Products. We're talking about appropriation levels going back to 2006, 2009, 2010. So all I'm asking is let's move this back to 2009.

An FY 2012 budget that was requested by the FDA's Tobacco Act was \$454 million, an increase of \$238 million from fiscal year 2010 enacted levels of \$235 million. So think of that: in 1 year it practically doubled, 110 percent increase.

Now, this is when we have a deficit, \$1.5 trillion every year, and we have a debt that's approaching \$15 trillion.

If we look at FY 2009, an \$85 million funding, from the fiscal year 2009 there's been a 500 percent increase in this new Center for Tobacco Products.

Tobacco regulation, obviously, is a new program at the FDA. They have been just champing at the bit over there for the last 25 years to be involved with the regulation of cigarettes and everything like that. They want to regulate tobacco, and I think, frankly, you know, the House voted for it. I accept that.

But we don't need to increase from 2009 up to what we're looking at, these large increases. We've got to return some of these increases to the debt and to the deficit. So a 500 percent increase in a budget is way too large. I suggest that funding should continue at the 2009 levels.

We are rolling back funding for many other programs, and it's proper to ensure that FDA also bears some of the burden during some of these most austere budgetary times.

Now, all of us know that smoking is bad. And the question is, what is the FDA doing through this Center for Tobacco Products? It's not clear to me, but do they have to increase over the years almost 500 percent?

Reducing their funding to fiscal year 2009 levels will be a restraint and will give the authorizing committee a chance to review the FDA regulations and review how the FDA plans to implement the law. I simply want to ensure that the FDA does not overreach with their authority, and ensure that it is using the best approach to ensure that tobacco harm is reduced. We all want to see it reduced.

But the question, we all have to take a sacrifice—doesn't the Center for Tobacco Products also have to contribute? There's no reason for it to have over these years a 500 percent increase.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I think this is a modest attempt to try and save money. It's quite a substantial amount of money for a good cause, which is reducing our deficit, our debt. In the long term, let the FDA and this new Center for Tobacco Products move forward, but not at these chomping, prodigious, gargantuan increases because they felt that it's catch-up time. I mean, every agency down here can come and say it's catch-up time. But obviously, under this economy and under this huge deficit, we cannot continue to look at agencies like this over this period of time getting a 500 percent increase in funding.

So I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. First of all, I hope that we don't have more of these ambush amendments that we haven't had a chance to really look at. And this one really has serious implications. What it seems that this amendment does is, first of all, reduce the tobacco industry's fees that they have to pay the Federal Government. This is a big help to the tobacco industry. It cuts fees that the private sector has to pay the Federal Government. And what do those fees go into? Into campaigns to reduce tobacco consumption and to treat the issues related to tobacco. That's the way the amendment reads to us.

And I'd just like to remind the author that I represent California. California has, time after time, put taxes on the ballot to increase tobacco taxes, and they've passed overwhelmingly. And we use those fees that would come from the industry from the sale of—not even the industry, they come from the user to run very effective anti-tobacco campaigns.

We reduced smoking in California almost to zero. I mean, it's incredible. Most cities in California don't allow

any smoking in public places. The communities I represent on the coastline don't allow you to even smoke on the beaches. You certainly can't smoke in public buildings and in any other kind of public space, even in public places that are privately owned.

So to do this, to ambush the anti-tobacco campaign with this amendment is just—it's a giveaway to the tobacco companies and reduces the fees they have to pay and hurts the ability to eliminate the illness caused by tobacco; and anybody who's had cancer in their family, as I've had, is very, very aware of the illnesses caused by tobacco users.

I think this is a very dangerous amendment and, hopefully, the gentleman will withdraw it. If not, we ought to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I was going to introduce an amendment, but I just want to make a statement and I'll withhold the amendment.

The statement I want to make is about what this underlying bill does to FDA. It cuts FDA, Federal Drug Administration, by 21 percent, about \$580 million. On top of that, the FDA has to absorb another \$37 million in higher rent costs. So we're really talking about a reduction to FDA of about \$600 million. And yet we keep the law in place so they have to continue all the current requirements and activities that are mandated to them.

This kind of cut means that 2,000 fewer domestic and foreign inspections of firms that manufacture food and medical products can be made. This kind of cut means that more than 9,000 fewer FDA import inspections to verify that imported food and medical products meet safety standards. This kind of cut means there will be 4,000 fewer food and medical product samplings to identify safety problems.

The amendment that I was going to introduce would have moved some funds from the Commissioner's Office to the Center for Devices and Radiological Health, or known as CDRH. The Center for Devices and Radiological Health is responsible for bringing new technologies to market, and to make the medical devices that are already on the market safer and more effective.

The FDA has implemented a more streamlined process by which medical

devices can get to market called the Innovation Pathway. But with the cuts to the FDA budget in this bill, the Innovation Pathway will become Innovation Roadblock.

At a hearing at the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health on February 17, 2011, the Director of CDRH, Dr. Jeffery Shuren, testified that these cuts: "The Innovation Pathway would be a non-option. And for the rest of what we do, this would result in increased delays in decisions. It would deny patients truly safe and effective innovative technologies. And it will result in jobs being lost."

□ 1500

So moving funds, even nominal funds, to CDRH makes a point that we would have to maintain a commitment to getting critical medical devices to market and to patients.

The other point I wanted to make is the Center for Devices and Radiological Health is also responsible in part for the FDA advances in medical countermeasures. This medical countermeasures program extends across several FDA offices. The program coordinates the appropriate responses to national medical catastrophes. For CDRH, that means putting in place the right medical responses to radiological threats, threats like a dirty bomb, a rogue nuclear device, or even a natural disaster like the one that occurred in Fukushima after the earthquake and tsunami.

This isn't just a health concern. It's a homeland security concern. Unless we are ready to handle these emergencies, many, many people could die or be permanently disabled. We have to prepare. The CDRH can do that for us, but not with a budget cut like the one the FDA is facing. The 21 percent cut in the FDA budget means the public health of Americans is put at risk, is put on hold. Medical safety devices are put on hold. Medical countermeasures are put on hold. Radiological treatment improvements, like new forms of x rays, PET scans and MRIs are put on hold.

I say it again, the 21 percent cut in the FDA budget is not good for America's health. I wish that we didn't have to adopt a budget with that kind of a cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, \$8,788,000, to remain available until expended.

#### INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

##### COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and the

rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, \$171,930,000, to remain available until September 30, 2013, including not to exceed \$3,000 for official reception and representation expenses, and not to exceed \$25,000 for the expenses for consultations and meetings hosted by the Commission with foreign governmental and other regulatory officials.

#### FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

##### LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$62,000,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit institutions, including the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to expenses associated with receiverships.

#### TITLE VII

##### GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### (INCLUDING CANCELLATIONS, RECISSIONS AND TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 701. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 461 passenger motor vehicles, of which 456 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 56, line 18, insert "231" in place of "461".

Page 56, line 19, insert "231" in place of "456".

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment, which would reduce the fleet of passenger vehicles that the USDA is able to purchase by half. Cutting the size of their fleet from 461 to 231 is a simple way to save our taxpayers some of their hard-earned money.

Mr. Chairman, I know many of my amendments cut programs that are near and dear to my colleagues' and their districts' hearts. We have heard clearly from our friends on both sides regarding that. But together, my amendments cut over \$2 billion, and we accrue more than twice that amount of debt every single day.

It's time to make the hard choices for the greater good of our economy. We have to cut wherever we can, and cutting about 230 vehicles out of the USDA's fleet is another way to save taxpayers money.

I encourage people to vote for my amendment.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR. I'm just curious. I have a point of inquiry for Mr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN, do you lease a car?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. FARR. You just drive your own private car?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I do, indeed. Mr. FARR. So you want to cut this account that is vehicles for the Department.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. By 230 vehicles, yes, sir.

Mr. FARR. And how do you expect them to get around?

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Well, maybe they could ride share. That would be a good way to save taxpayer dollars also.

Mr. FARR. Well, I don't think we can operate government on a maybe, and I oppose this amendment.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 702. The Secretary of Agriculture may transfer unobligated balances of discretionary funds appropriated by this Act or other available unobligated discretionary balances of the Department of Agriculture to the Working Capital Fund for the acquisition of plant and capital equipment necessary for the delivery of financial, administrative, and information technology services of primary benefit to the agencies of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the prior notification to the agency administrator: *Provided further*, That none of the funds transferred to the Working Capital Fund pursuant to this section shall be available for obligation without the prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress: *Provided further*, That of annual income amounts in the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture allocated for the National Finance Center, the Secretary may reserve not more than 4 percent for the replacement or acquisition of capital equipment, including equipment for the improvement and implementation of a financial management plan, information technology, and other systems of the National Finance Center or to pay any unforeseen, extraordinary cost of the National Finance Center: *Provided further*, That none of the amounts reserved shall be available for obligation unless the Secretary submits notification of the obligation to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That the limitation on the obligation of funds pending notification to Congressional Committees shall not apply to any obligation that, as determined by the Secretary, is necessary to respond to a declared state of emergency that significantly impacts the operations of the National Finance Center; or to evacuate employees of the National Finance Center to a safe haven to continue operations of the National Finance Center.

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 704. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 percent of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two

parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 705. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in the current fiscal year shall remain available until expended to disburse obligations made in the current fiscal year for the following accounts: the Rural Development Loan Fund program account, the Rural Electrification and Telecommunication Loans program account, and the Rural Housing Insurance Fund program account.

SEC. 706. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to carry out section 410 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 679a) or section 30 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 471).

SEC. 707. None of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture by this Act may be used to acquire new information technology systems or significant upgrades, as determined by the Office of the Chief Information Officer, without the approval of the Chief Information Officer and the concurrence of the Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be transferred to the Office of the Chief Information Officer unless prior notification has been transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress: *Provided further*, That none of the funds available to the Department of Agriculture for information technology shall be obligated for projects over \$25,000 prior to receipt of written approval by the Chief Information Officer.

SEC. 708. Funds made available under section 1240I and section 1241(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 and section 524(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)) in the current fiscal year shall remain available until expended to disburse obligations made in the current fiscal year.

SEC. 709. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any former RUS borrower that has repaid or prepaid an insured, direct or guaranteed loan under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, or any not-for-profit utility that is eligible to receive an insured or direct loan under such Act, shall be eligible for assistance under section 313(b)(2)(B) of such Act in the same manner as a borrower under such Act.

SEC. 710. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purposes of a grant under section 412 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998, none of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to prohibit the provision of in-kind support from non-Federal sources under section 412(e)(3) of such Act in the form of unrecovered indirect costs not otherwise charged against the grant, consistent with the indirect rate of cost approved for a recipient.

SEC. 711. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, unobligated balances remaining available at the end of the fiscal year from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses in this Act for the Farm Service Agency and the Rural Development mission area, shall remain available through September 30, 2013, for information technology expenses.

SEC. 712. The Secretary of Agriculture may authorize a State agency to use funds provided in this Act to exceed the maximum amount of liquid infant formula specified in 7 C.F.R. 246.10 when issuing liquid infant formula to participants.

SEC. 713. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for first-class travel by the employees of agencies funded by this Act in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301–10.124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 714. In the case of each program established or amended by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246), other than by title I or subtitle A of title III of such Act, that is authorized or required to be carried out using funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation—

(1) such funds shall be available for salaries and related administrative expenses, including technical assistance, associated with the implementation of the program, without regard to the limitation on the total amount of allotments and fund transfers contained in section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714i); and

(2) the use of such funds for such purpose shall not be considered to be a fund transfer or allotment for purposes of applying the limitation on the total amount of allotments and fund transfers contained in such section.

SEC. 715. In carrying out subsection (h) of section 502 of the Housing Act of 1949, the Secretary may use the authority described in subsections (h) and (j) of section 538 of such Act.

SEC. 716. Clause (ii) of section 524(b)(4)(B) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “fiscal years 2008 through 2012” and inserting “certain fiscal years”; and

(2) in the text, by striking “2012” and inserting “2014”.

SEC. 717. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture made available in fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007 to carry out section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb) for the cost of direct loans shall remain available until expended to disburse valid obligations made in fiscal years 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008.

SEC. 718. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out a program under subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv) of section 14222 of Public Law 110–246 in excess of \$948,000,000, as follows: Child Nutrition Programs – \$465,000,000; State Option Contract – \$5,000,000; Removal of Defective Commodities – \$2,500,000; Disaster Relief – \$5,000,000; Additional Fruits, Vegetables, and Nuts Purchases – \$206,000,000; Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program – \$20,000,000; Estimated Future Needs – \$196,713,000; and, Administrative Funds – \$47,787,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act shall be used for salaries and expenses to carry out section 19(i)(1)(E) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act as amended by section 4304 of Public Law 110–246 in excess of \$20,000,000, including the transfer of funds under subsection (c) of section 14222 of Public Law 110–246, until October 1, 2012: *Provided further*, That \$133,000,000 made available on October 1, 2012, to carry out section 19(i)(1)(E) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act as amended by section 4304 of Public Law 110–246 shall be excluded from the limitation described in subsection (b)(2)(A)(v) of section 14222 of Public Law 110–246: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any employee of the Department of Agriculture or officer of the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out clause (3) of section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), or for any surplus removal activities or price support activities under sec-

tion 5 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act: *Provided further*, That of the available unobligated balances under (b)(2)(A)(iv) of section 14222 of Public Law 110–246, \$150,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 719. Of the funds made available by this Act, not more than \$1,800,000 shall be used to cover necessary expenses of activities related to all advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces of the Department of Agriculture, except for panels used to comply with negotiated rule makings and panels used to evaluate competitively awarded grants.

SEC. 720. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay indirect costs charged against any agricultural research, education, or extension grant awards issued by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture that exceed 30 percent of total Federal funds provided under each award: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 1462 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3310), funds provided by this Act for grants awarded competitively by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture shall be available to pay full allowable indirect costs for each grant awarded under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638).

SEC. 721. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to write, prepare, develop, or publish a final rule or an interim final rule in furtherance of, or otherwise to implement, the proposed rule entitled “Implementation of Regulations Required Under Title XI of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008; Conduct in Violation of the Act” (75 Fed. Reg. 35338 (June 22, 2010)).

SEC. 722. The unobligated balances available for the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Forestry Incentives Program, as identified by Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol 12X3336, \$5,500,000 are rescinded, and the unobligated balances available for the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Great Plains Conservation Program, as identified by Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol 12X2268, \$500,000 are rescinded.

SEC. 723. Of the unobligated balances provided pursuant to section 16(h)(1)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, \$11,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

SEC. 724. Section 1238E(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838e(a)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2014”.

SEC. 725. (a) Section 1240B(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–2(a)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2014”.

(b) Section 1241(a)(6)(E) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)(6)(E)) is amended by striking “fiscal year 2012” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2012 through 2014”.

SEC. 726. Section 1241(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “2012,” and inserting “2012 and fiscal year 2014 in the case of the programs specified in paragraphs (3)(B), (4), (6), and (7).”; and

(2) in paragraph (4)(E), by striking “fiscal year 2012” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2012 through 2014”.

SEC. 727. Section 1241(a)(7)(D) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)(7)(D)) is amended by striking “2012” and inserting “2014”.

SEC. 728. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out the following:

(1) The Conservation Stewardship Program authorized by sections 1238D–1238G of the



Food Security of Act 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838d-3838g) in excess of \$634,000,000.

(2) The Watershed Rehabilitation program authorized by section 14(h) of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012(h)).

(3) The Environmental Quality Incentives Program as authorized by sections 1241–1240H of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa–3839aa-8) in excess of \$1,400,000,000.

(4) The Farmland Protection Program as authorized by section 1238I of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838I) in excess of \$150,000,000.

(5) The Grassland Reserve Program as authorized by sections 1238O–1238Q of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838o–3838q) in excess of 209,000 acres in fiscal year 2012.

(6) The Wetlands Reserve Program authorized by sections 1237–1237F of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837–3837f) to enroll in excess of 185,800 acres in fiscal year 2012.

(7) The Wildlife Habitat Incentives Act authorized by section 1240N of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb-1) in excess of \$50,000,000.

(8) The Voluntary Public Access and Habitat Incentives Program authorized by section 1240R of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb-5).

(9) The Biomass Crop Assistance Program authorized by section 9011 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8111).

(10) The Bioenergy Program for Advanced Biofuels authorized by section 9005 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8105) in excess of \$55,000,000.

(11) The Rural Energy for America Program authorized by section 9007 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8107).

(12) The Rural Microentrepreneur Assistance Program authorized by section 6022 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 2008s).

(13) Section 508(d)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(d)(3)) to provide a performance-based premium discount in the crop insurance program.

(14) Agricultural Management Assistance Program as authorized by section 524 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1524) in excess of \$2,500,000 for the Natural Resources conservation Service.

SEC. 729. The funds made available in Public Law 111-344 through February 12, 2012 for trade adjustment for farmers are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 730. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to carry out the emergency food assistance program authorized by section 27(a) of the Food and Nutrition Stamp Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2036(a)) if such program exceeds \$200,000,000.

SEC. 731. (a) CLOSURE AND CONVEYANCE OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE FACILITIES.—The Secretary of Agriculture may close up to 10 facilities of the Agricultural Research Service, as proposed in the budget of the President for fiscal year 2012 submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—With respect to an Agricultural Research Service facility to be closed pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture may convey, with or without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any real property, including improvements and equipment thereon, of the facility to an eligible entity specified in subsection (c). If the Agricultural Research Service facility consists of more than one parcel of real property, the Secretary may convey each parcel separately and to different eligible entities.

(c) ENTITIES.—The following entities are eligible to receive real property under subsection (b):

(1) Land-grant colleges and universities (as defined in section 1404(13) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103(13))).

(2) 1994 Institutions (as defined in section 532 of the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note; Public Law 103-382)).

(3) Hispanic-serving agricultural colleges and universities (as defined in section 1404(10) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3103(10))).

(d) CONDITIONS ON RECEIPT.—As a condition of the conveyance of real property under subsection (b), the recipient of the property must—

(1) be located in the same State or territory of the United States in which the property is located; and

(2) agree to accept and use the property for agricultural and natural resources research for a minimum of 25 years.

SEC. 732. Section 9 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) FOOD DONATION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each school and local educational agency participating in the school lunch program under this Act may donate any food not consumed under such program to eligible local food banks or charitable organizations.

“(2) GUIDANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall develop and publish guidance to schools and local educational agencies participating in the school lunch program under this Act to assist such schools and local educational agencies in donating food under this subsection.

“(B) UPDATES.—The Secretary shall update such guidance as necessary.

“(3) LIABILITY.—Any school or local educational agency making donations pursuant to this subsection shall be exempt from civil and criminal liability to the extent provided under the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act (42 U.S.C. 1791).

“(4) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘eligible local food banks or charitable organizations’ means any food bank or charitable organization which is exempt from tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)).”

SEC. 733. Notwithstanding this Act or any other Act, of the unobligated balances available to the Department of Agriculture from prior appropriations, with the exception of Rural Development and Domestic Food Programs, \$63,000,000 in appropriated discretionary funds are hereby rescinded: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 734. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Agriculture or the Food and Drug Administration shall be used to transmit or otherwise make available to any non-Department of Agriculture or non-Department of Health and Human Services employee questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

SEC. 735. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in the current fiscal year, or pro-

vided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds, or in the case of the Department of Agriculture, through use of the authority provided by section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) or section 8 of Public Law 89-106 (7 U.S.C. 2263), that—

(1) creates new programs;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted;

(4) relocates an office or employees;

(5) reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or

(6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees;

unless the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (as the case may be) notifies, in writing, the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 30 days in advance of the reprogramming of such funds or the use of such authority.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in the current fiscal year, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming or use of the authorities referred to in subsection (a) involving funds in excess of \$500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that—

(1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities;

(2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress; or

(3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress; unless the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (as the case may be) notifies, in writing, the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress at least 30 days in advance of the reprogramming of such funds or the use of such authority.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress before implementing any program or activity not carried out during the previous fiscal year unless the program or activity is funded by this Act or specifically funded by any other Act.

SEC. 736. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who prepare or submit appropriations language as part of the President's Budget submission to the Congress of the United States for programs under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies that assumes revenues or reflects a reduction from the previous year due to user fees proposals that have not been enacted into law prior to the submission of the Budget unless such Budget submission identifies which additional

spending reductions should occur in the event the user fees proposals are not enacted prior to the date of the convening of a committee of conference for the fiscal year 2013 appropriations Act.

SEC. 737. Unless otherwise authorized by existing law, none of the funds provided in this Act, may be used by an executive branch agency to produce any prepackaged news story intended for broadcast or distribution in the United States unless the story includes a clear notification within the text or audio of the prepackaged news story that the prepackaged news story was prepared or funded by that executive branch agency.

SEC. 738. No employee of the Department of Agriculture may be detailed or assigned from an agency or office funded by this act to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

SEC. 739. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries or expenses of personnel to—

(1) inspect horses under section 3 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 603);

(2) inspect horses under section 903 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 1901 note; Public Law 104-127); or

(3) implement or enforce section 352.19 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations.

□ 1510

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 77, line 12, strike the semicolon and insert “; or”.

Page 77, line 15, strike “; or” and insert a period.

Page 77, strike lines 16 through 17.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would remove the restriction only on the fee-for-service horse meat inspection portion. Since fiscal year 2006, Congress has prohibited the use of Federal funds to inspect horses. However, the USDA allowed for a fee-for-service program for mandatory inspection of horses destined for food until 2008, when Congress prohibited the program through an appropriations rider.

Before these bans, horse processing was a \$65 million a year industry and owners could receive about \$400 to \$800 when selling a horse. I am offering this amendment because owners should have the option of selling their horse for processing under their personal property rights. It is not the Federal Government's role to ban this option. The decision to allow for processing should be made by the States.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations has directed GAO to examine the effects of this ban on the welfare of horses and on the agriculture industry. This report was expected by March 1 of 2010. Over a full year later, we still have yet to be delivered a final report from GAO, but expect one within weeks

of this debate. It is important that this analysis be considered when determining whether to consider this ban.

In particular, the GAO was asked to examine how many horses are now being shipped to Mexico and Canada for slaughter, which outside analysis has confirmed is increasing. With the increased exporting of animals comes the concern of longer transportation times to slaughter and reduced inspections by USDA of travel conditions. USDA has no authority to ensure humane treatment once horses cross the border to Mexico or Canada, and there is no reason to believe horses are receiving better treatment by continuing this ban.

Additionally, there continue to be reports of increased animal abuse during the reduced options for unwanted horses. I can assure you this is true in my home State of Wyoming. Recently, 100 horses have been seized from a western Wyoming ranch where they were being starved and had to be transported to the eastern side of the State to the State's Cheyenne stockyards. While the state veterinarian is caring for the animals currently, the options for selling these horses are limited.

There is just no place to send unwanted horses, and neglect will continue to rise across the country without a viable alternative. In fact, the Wyoming legislature this year made it a crime to release a horse on to public lands. Now, the reason people do that is because there is no other way to get rid of an unwanted horse. There is no opportunity to sell them into this meat market, so people are turning them loose with the feral horses, the wild horses, further exacerbating the Federal wild horse problem.

Congress needs to examine these concerns, and the GAO report should provide us the information needed to make an educated decision on this matter.

Now, I plan to withdraw my amendment after discussing this issue, but would like to provide my colleagues with the opportunity to present their States' concerns with this ban and to ensure moving forward we examine the GAO report before finalizing any appropriations language for fiscal year 2012.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlelady from Wyoming bringing this amendment.

You know, many times people think that horse slaughter is just simply inhumane. Somehow they think that horse starvation is somehow more humane. The truth is that people are going to get rid of their horses in some way, so what they do in New Mexico and in the Western States is they simply take them out and turn them loose.

Right now we are struggling with an economy, an economy that is having

difficulties from every area, and too often we say it is just a problem of the economy. We don't break it down to its individual components.

One of the components in New Mexico is that we have completely eliminated sheep from New Mexico. New Mexico used to be a large area of sheep production. That piece of the economy is simply gone because of regulations we in Washington and the States have put into place. New Mexico also used to have a vibrant apple economy. That is now gone because we have given favorable treatment to overseas products.

But then this is another element of the economy that has simply disappeared. New Mexico used to have a vibrant horse trade. Prices were high. Now prices on horses are low because people know they have no option at the end of a horse's life, so it is simply doing away with the horse market.

So we find that we in Congress are causing the economic decay of our entire Nation, and the gentlelady's amendment simply says let's study the facts. Let's understand what is going on that we ourselves are causing. Let's understand the economic duress that Washington and the States are putting on their own economies. It makes ultimate sense, and for us in the West it should be absolutely reinstated. We should reinstate the market there, because horses are being very inhumanely treated in the guise of some more humane treatment. So I thank the lady for her presentation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I rise in support of the Lummis amendment. I am disappointed that she is planning to withdraw it and that we will not be having a vote on it. We had a vote on it in full committee. It was actually Mr. MORAN's amendment that pulled it out. I did not support the gentleman from Virginia's amendment because I believe there is a lot of emotion that goes on when we are dealing with a horse. It still is a private property issue, a personal property issue, and while I do not own horses, I have family members who own horses. I know that you do have to have someplace to move the horse on to when it ages out on you.

It is very emotional in America. We look down at other nations that eat horses, but I have eaten horse before. In Kazakhstan I ate horse, and it wasn't bad. But we as Americans, we have an obesity problem, so we can pick and choose what we want to eat and what we don't want to eat, and people feel like, well, we are too good to be eating horses. I understand that, but the rest of the world does eat horses and I think, frankly, that is a different discussion, as my friend from Virginia knows. But I wish we were having a vote on it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1520

Mr. MORAN. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. I do rise in opposition to this amendment that would allow horse slaughtering to resume in the United States.

The language that the gentlelady's amendment would strike was put into the bill as a bipartisan amendment by two Republicans and a Democrat—Mr. Sweeney, Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. Spratt. What it did is to restrict funding for Federal activities involved with meat inspection. Thereby, it stopped horse slaughter for the purpose of human consumption in any facility in the United States, and it stopped new facilities from opening. It passed this body by an overwhelming vote: 269–158. Now, every year since, the language has been retained in the Agriculture appropriations bill. There are six very good reasons for doing this.

One, it's money badly spent. Only foreign corporations which deal in horse meat for consumption in foreign markets would benefit from the Federal inspection of U.S. horse slaughter plants. So we are using American taxpayer money to inspect meat so that foreign corporations can send it overseas so that people living in foreign countries can consume it. There is a \$37 million cut below last year's levels in the Food Safety and Inspection Service. So here you are cutting \$37 million in food safety inspection. Yet you would be adding this additional burden onto the Food Safety and Inspection Service, an additional responsibility to inspect horse meat. Remember, this is meat that will be exclusively consumed in foreign countries. Before the ban, most meat was exported to France, Belgium and Japan. We should be using our resources to focus on meat consumed by our constituents.

Secondly, the American public overwhelmingly does not support the slaughter of horses for human consumption. Three-quarters of our constituents across the country oppose the slaughter of horses for human consumption.

Thirdly, American horse meat invariably contains harmful chemicals because horses are not raised for human consumption. A recent FDA toxicity report found any number of substances that could cause adverse effects in humans. One example is phenylbutazone. It's known as "bute." It is the most common anti-inflammatory given to horses. It is difficult to know every substance given to every horse in the United States. Because they're not intended to be raised as food, they're given different chemicals. The only way to ensure that such harmful substances don't make it into the food

supply is to prevent horse meat from entering the market.

Fourth, most horses sent to slaughter are, in fact, healthy. Sometimes it's framed, as my friend from Georgia suggested, as a way to dispose of unwanted horses. The facts don't support this claim. When horse slaughter was allowed in the U.S., 92 percent of horses sent to slaughter were healthy and could have continued to have been used as productive animals. They weren't old and infirm, because sick and old horses aren't used as a food source. People don't want to eat meat from sick, old horses. So we are talking about primarily healthy horses.

Fifth, other, more humane options are available. A licensed veterinarian can humanely euthanize a horse for \$225. That is not cost-prohibitive.

I want to underscore, too, that my very good friend was complaining that there was too much emotion in this argument. What's wrong with emotion? I mean, the horses inspire us. That's why most of the statues around the U.S. Capitol are of horses and of heroes riding on horses. Horses were critical to the expansion of the West. They aided in the development of agriculture. They provide entertainment and recreation similar to dogs and cats. They are treasured and loyal companion animals, and we revere them. That's why the American public rejects slaughtering them for human consumption.

So let's just summarize here.

A vote for this amendment is a vote to overturn established policy that was enacted under Republicans and supported by the American people to prevent horse slaughter to resume in this country. It would be diverting inspection funding, which is being cut substantially, to inspect meat that foreign corporations will be able to sell to foreign consumers. That's not something this body should support.

With that, I can argue against every claim that was made, but I don't think I will take up the time to do that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I do want to clarify for the record that this amendment is not about tax dollars. This amendment is about adjusting some policy that was put into an appropriations bill some time ago, long before the current makeup of Congress. We are talking about a fee-for-service scenario that would allow the private sector to ensure that there is safe, affordable horse meat to the general public, to a market overseas that is very robust.

Let me also say that a GAO study on the effects of horse slaughter plant closings on the welfare of horses and on the farm economy as a whole was requested by the Senate Ag Appropriations Committee more than a year and a half ago, and is overdue for a report.

The devastated horse industry continues to be attacked by misinformation, and we certainly have a problem here because I would allege that the economics of the ownership of horses are upside down. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the result of this misguided campaign will eventually be a Nation where very few can even afford to own a horse. Without a secondary market, the value of horses at every level has plunged. Fewer horses mean fewer jobs, fewer horse trailers sold, fewer veterinary service dollars spent, fewer saddles sold—and the list continues.

Destroying the U.S. horse industry closed the U.S. to a very robust global market and gave other countries this economic opportunity. With the ability to ethically produce horse meat under regulated, humane conditions in the United States, we would almost immediately create jobs and minimize suffering.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member seek recognition?

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia inadvertently misrepresented the terms of this amendment. They only applied to the fee-for-service component.

With that, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DICKS. A point of order.

I think the gentlelady has already spoken on her amendment.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I am asking for unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. DICKS. We never heard that. I object. If you withdraw the amendment, I won't object.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Now I am not going to withdraw the amendment. I will ask for a vote.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say to the gentlelady that this is an emotional issue, and those of us who do not agree with you feel strongly about it.

Now, I believe, if you put that amendment in, it could very well jeopardize the ag bill. I don't think you want to do that, so I hope you will reconsider withdrawing this amendment. In committee, your amendment was defeated. There are a lot of people in this country who feel very strongly on both sides of this issue, but the American public, whether or not you agree with them, feels very strongly, as Mr. MORAN said, so I hope you will change your mind.

Regarding some of the things I've heard about these horses starving to death on the plains and everything—and I was not going to speak on this—there are a number of people in this country who are willing to put up millions and millions of dollars. In fact, I know some of them. They have bought ranches and want to take these wild horses and put them into an area where they will be safe, where they will be

protected, where they will be cared for. We are talking about, in addition to the ranches, maybe another 600,000 or 700,000 acres that would be used for these horses and for them to be able to survive.

□ 1530

If you have ever looked at the way they transport these horses to slaughter, they cram 20 horses into a truck that's built for 10. They don't feed them. They don't water them properly. And those horses are so mistreated, it's unbelievable, when they go to slaughter. And that's why they close these slaughterhouses. In addition, you ought to see what they do in these slaughterhouses for these horses. They hang them up by a hook while they're still alive and they're squealing, and they kill them in a very inhumane way.

I am not for changing our agricultural attitudes in this country. We have to have the slaughter of pigs and cows and chickens and that sort of thing. So a lot of times people say if we're against horse slaughter, we want to do something to hurt the agriculture community. That couldn't be further from the truth. We just want to make sure that these animals are treated in a humane way, number one, and, number two, that the American taxpayer is not paying for the French to get horse meat.

So let me just say to the lady one more time, I sincerely hope that she will reconsider. We have a disagreement. I hope you will reconsider and withdraw this amendment because I don't think something of this emotional status should impede or impair something as important as the ag bill.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON of Georgia. I rise in strong support of the amendment and believe that while it may be an emotional issue—and as my friend from Virginia said and my friend from Indiana said, emotion is good. I think that there can be emotion on both sides. But there's also a lot of logic in the gentlewoman's position, and that's why I'm a strong supporter of it.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Before I withdraw the amendment, I wish to correct that this amendment has never been considered in committee or on the floor. This amendment only applies to the two lines in this horse inspection issue which deal with an individual's right to pay their own money to have a horse inspected. There are no taxpayer dollars involved in this amendment. I'm only striking the two lines that now you're even not allowing people to pay their own money to have a horse inspected.

With that opportunity to correct the record, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Congresswoman LUMMIS.

As a farmer and senior member of the authorizing committee, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss this issue and speak in opposition to the language in section 737 of the agriculture appropriations bill for FY 2012 and its attempt to limit state rights and commerce with respect to horse meat, and the safe and healthy inspection of those deceased animals.

The amendment before us would simply allow horse slaughter facilities to use their own money for inspections.

While no one likes the idea of slaughtering horses we must deal with the problem of abandoned and neglected horses in the United States.

We hear frequently on this topic the issue of humane treatment. However, on average, adoption facilities used as a "last resource" can only house approximately 30 horses.

Often times these adoption facilities are so over-crowded that older horses end up starving to death because the real last resort is abandoning these horses, which happens all too frequently.

Each year there are almost 100,000 abandoned and neglected horses in the United States. Opponent of horse slaughter often claim that unwanted horses can be moved to adoption facilities.

I believe that current limits on horse slaughter set poor precedent for legitimate livestock slaughter for reasons other than for food safety or public health.

As a long time horse owner, I understand the emotional attachment one can feel for an animal, however, currently with the over capacity of animal adoption facilities I have concerns on what would happen to abandoned and neglected horses each year.

#### RESTORE THE HORSEMEAT INDUSTRY AND CREATE JOBS

Two weeks ago, the House Appropriations committee voted to reinsert language into the Agriculture Appropriations bill to prevent funds for inspections—inspections that are required by law—of horsemeat, continuing a logic-defying policy that harms the welfare of horses, infringes on the rights of horse owners, and cripples the horse industry. Most of all, it prevents the immediate creation of hundreds of good, American jobs. The unemployment rate just hit 9.1 percent and both parties are blaming the other for it. In this instance both are to blame for killing the highly regulated horsemeat industry.

Before 2005, the horsemeat industry was a \$65 million a year business. In 2003, the two Texas plants employed a total of 130 people to process 40,000 horses per year. One small business that shipped the meat noted in a 2002 letter that it employed twenty-one people, all of whom were heads of households. Their annual horsemeat airfreight exports generated \$4 million for the airlines they used. These jobs are all gone.

Instead, they are in Mexico and Canada. Now horses are shipped much greater distances and at higher costs to slaughter, and are slaughtered without USDA regulation. Last year, over 150,000 horses were sent across the borders to be processed. Horse processing serves to set a floor price for horses. The higher cost of shipping them to

Canada and Mexico has lowered the price owners receive for any horse, and the effects ripple through the entire horse industry. Many U.S. zoos use horsemeat to feed their animals because it's high in protein and low in fat. Ironically, those zoos now have to buy horsemeat—derived from American horses—from Mexico or Canada.

Advocates in favor of this irresponsible policy, like my former colleague, Rep. Jim Moran (D-VA), say that horse processing is "not humane." He's wrong, and the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) and the American Association of Equine Practitioners (AAEP) say he's wrong. The U.S. plants used "penetrating captive bolt" to euthanize horses before they closed, a technique common to the beef industry and considered humane for horses by AVMA and AAEP. As with processing plants for all animals, there are laws on the books for humane slaughter methods for horses, and FSIS inspectors present to ensure those laws are followed.

Concerns about the safeness of horsemeat are misplaced. Both USDA and the European Union regulate horsemeat stringently, and the U.S. processing plants kept horses for withdrawal periods depending on the drugs (if any) that had been administered to them. The plants also performed constant residue testing in their holding pens, and if a harmful substance was detected the entire lot would be condemned. To my knowledge, the EU has never had any issues with "contaminated" horsemeat imported from the U.S.

I believe the shuttering of the processing plants, combined with the recession has led to an increase in abandoned and neglected horses. Others disagree. GAO is planning to release a report on the impact of the closing of the processing plants on horses hopefully by the end of the month, yet the House is scheduled to vote on Tuesday to continue this policy without having the benefit of this report's conclusions, whatever they may be. I think that is bad governing.

Let's be clear: horses are livestock under the law—not companion animals such as dogs as Rep. Moran has said—and are allowed to be deducted as diminishing assets and their expenses written off accordingly. Horses are expensive to maintain, and can cost \$500 to \$2,000 to euthanize by lethal injection and bury—assuming you can find a place that is willing to dispose of a 1,500 pound animal filled with drugs. Horse owners deserve a humane end of life option for their horses that has monetary value. Right now, Republicans and Democrats are using emotional arguments to an ill-informed public to deny horse owners their rights. In the process, they are preventing the creation of American jobs and causing more inhumane treatment of horses.

Charles W. Stenholm served the 17th U.S. House District of Texas as a Democrat, 1979–2005. He is now a Senior Policy Advisor with Olsson Frank Weeda Terman Bode Matz PC.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

The amendment offered by Ms. DELAUNO of Connecticut.

The amendment offered by Mr. SESSIONS of Texas.

The amendment offered by Mr. FARR of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

The amendment offered by Mr. CHAFFETZ of Utah.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

The amendment offered by Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

The amendment offered by Ms. RICHARDSON of California.

Amendment A by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment A by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

The amendment offered by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Amendment B by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment B by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. BROWN of Georgia.

The amendment offered by Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 226, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—193

Ackerman	Costello	Hastings (FL)
Altmire	Courtney	Heinrich
Baca	Critz	Higgins
Baldwin	Crowley	Himes
Barrow	Cuellar	Hinchee
Becerra	Cummings	Hinojosa
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Hirono
Berman	Davis (IL)	Hochul
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Holden
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Holt
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hoyer
Boren	Dent	Inslee
Boswell	Deutch	Israel
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Brown (FL)	Doggett	(TX)
Butterfield	Dold	Johnson (GA)
Capps	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson, E. B.
Capuano	Doyle	Jones
Carnahan	Edwards	Kaptur
Carney	Ellison	Keating
Carson (IN)	Engel	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Farr	Kind
Chandler	Fattah	Kissell
Cicilline	Filner	Kucinich
Clarke (MI)	Fudge	Langevin
Clarke (NY)	Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Gonzalez	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Green, Al	Lee (CA)
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Levin
Cohen	Grijalva	Lewis (GA)
Connolly (VA)	Gutierrez	Lipinski
Conyers	Hanabusa	LoBiondo
Cooper	Hanna	Loebsack

Lofgren, Zoe	Perlmutter	Shuler
Lowey	Peters	Sires
Lujan	Peterson	Smith (NJ)
Lynch	Pingree (ME)	Smith (WA)
Maloney	Platts	Speier
Markey	Polis	Stark
Matheson	Price (NC)	Sutton
Matsui	Quigley	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
McCollum	Reichert	Tierney
McDermott	Reyes	Tonko
McGovern	Richardson	Towns
McIntyre	Richmond	Tsongas
McNerney	Ross (AR)	Upton
Meeks	Rothman (NJ)	Van Hollen
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Miller (NC)	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Miller, George	Rush	Walden
Moore	Ryan (OH)	Walz (MN)
Moran	Sanchez, Linda	Wasserman
Murphy (CT)	T.	Schultz
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Watt
Neal	Schakowsky	Waxman
Oliver	Schiff	Welch
Owens	Schrader	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Schwartz	Wolf
Pascarella	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
Pastor (AZ)	Scott, David	Wu
Paulsen	Serrano	Yarmuth
Payne	Sewell	
Pelosi	Sherman	

#### NOES—226

Adams	Fleming	Lummis
Aderholt	Flores	Lungren, Daniel
Akin	Forbes	E.
Alexander	Fortenberry	Mack
Amash	Fox	Manzullo
Austria	Franks (AZ)	Marchant
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	Marino
Barletta	Gallegly	McCarthy (CA)
Bartlett	Gardner	McCaul
Barton (TX)	Garrett	McClintock
Bass (NH)	Gerlach	McCotter
Benishek	Gibbs	McHenry
Berg	Gibson	McKeon
Biggert	Gingrey (GA)	McKinley
Bilbray	Gohmert	McMorris
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Rodgers
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	Meehan
Black	Gowdy	Mica
Blackburn	Granger	Miller (FL)
Bonner	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)
Bono Mack	Graves (MO)	Miller, Gary
Boustany	Griffin (AR)	Mulvaney
Brady (TX)	Griffith (VA)	Murphy (PA)
Brooks	Grimm	Myrick
Brown (GA)	Guinta	Neugebauer
Buchanan	Guthrie	Noem
Bucshon	Hall	Nugent
Buerkle	Harper	Nunes
Burgess	Harris	Nunnelee
Burton (IN)	Hartzler	Olson
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Palazzo
Camp	Hayworth	Paul
Campbell	Heck	Pearce
Canseco	Hensarling	Pence
Cantor	Herger	Petri
Capito	Herrera Beutler	Pitts
Cardoza	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)
Carter	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Cassidy	Hultgren	Posey
Chabot	Hunter	Price (GA)
Chaffetz	Hurt	Quayle
Coble	Issa	Reed
Coffman (CO)	Jenkins	Rehberg
Cole	Johnson (IL)	Renacci
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Ribble
Costa	Johnson, Sam	Rigell
Cravaack	Jordan	Rivera
Crawford	Kelly	Roby
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Roe (TN)
Culberson	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Davis (KY)	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (MI)
DesJarlais	Kline	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Rooney
Dreier	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Duffy	Lance	Roskam
Duncan (SC)	Landry	Ross (FL)
Duncan (TN)	Lankford	Royce
Ellmers	Latham	Runyan
Emerson	LaTourette	Ryan (WI)
Farenthold	Latta	Scalise
Fincher	Lewis (CA)	Schilling
Fitzpatrick	Long	Schmidt
Flake	Lucas	Schock
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert

Scott (SC)	Stutzman	West
Scott, Austin	Sullivan	Westmoreland
Sensenbrenner	Terry	Whitfield
Sessions	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Shimkus	Thornberry	Wittman
Shuster	Tiberi	Womack
Simpson	Tipton	Woodall
Smith (NE)	Turner	Yoder
Smith (TX)	Walberg	Young (AK)
Southerland	Walsh (IL)	Young (FL)
Stearns	Webster	Young (IN)

#### NOT VOTING—13

Andrews	Frank (MA)	Slaughter
Bachmann	Giffords	Stivers
Bass (CA)	Honda	Weiner
Chu	Rangel	
Eshoo	Rokita	

□ 1602

Messrs. STUTZMAN, AUSTRIA, JOHNSON of Ohio and HALL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. WALDEN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. CHU. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 420, the DeLauro amendment to increase funding for the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition by \$1 million, had I been present I would have voted “aye.” This amendment would have improved food safety and protect the American people from E. coli bacterial outbreaks.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LONG was allowed to speak out of order.)

#### HONORING MISSOURI TORNADO VICTIMS

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the House observe a moment of silence in honor of the victims of the tornado which hit Joplin, Missouri, on May 22. As the Congressman representing Missouri's Seventh District, which includes Joplin, I ask that we observe a moment of silence for those effected by the EF-5 tornado that struck this town of 50,000 people on the 22nd of May. This horrific event led to a loss of life of 153 individuals, from babies to folks in their nineties. Also, they lost 54 percent of their school capacity, 8,000 homes, and 500 businesses.

The Acting CHAIR. Will the Members please rise and observe a moment of silence.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 199, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]

## AYES—226

Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Amash  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (NH)  
Benishkek  
Berg  
Biggert  
Billray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Brown (GA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Gardner  
Garrett

Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herrera Beutler  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latham  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Myrick  
Neugebauer

Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Runyan  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

## NOES—199

Ackerman  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)

Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers

Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)

Doyle  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Emerson  
Engel  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gerlach  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Higgins  
Himes  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nader  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond

Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebssack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nader  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond

Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—7

Eshoo  
Giffords  
Rangel

Rokita  
Slaughter  
Stivers

Weiner

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is less than 1 minute remaining  
on this vote.

□ 1609

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from California (Mr. FARR)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the noes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 352, noes 70,  
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

## AYES—352

Ellmers  
Engel  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fitzpatrick  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garamendi  
Gardner  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
McCotter  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffin (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heinrich  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
Cohen  
Cole  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison

Ackerman  
Akin  
Alexander  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benishkek  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggert  
Billray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brooks  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellison

Loebssack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nader  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunnelee  
Oliver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Runyan  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes



Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NE)

## NOES—70

Adams  
Aderholt  
Altmire  
Amash  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bonner  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor  
Carter  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Conaway  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Duncan (SC)  
Emerson  
Farenthold  
Fincher

## NOT VOTING—10

Eshoo  
Giffords  
Herger  
Markey

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1613

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 120, noes 304, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

## AYES—120

Adams  
Altmire  
Amash  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Benishek  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Bono Mack  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chandler  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cooper  
Cravaack  
Davis (KY)  
Dent  
Doggett  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Floss  
Franks (AZ)  
Gallegly  
Garrett  
Gibson

## NOES—304

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonner  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canseco  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway

Gingrey (GA)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Green, Gene  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Harris  
Heinrich  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Himes  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Insee  
Issa  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
King (NY)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Larsen (WA)  
Long  
Lummis  
Mack  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry

Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Luján  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Marino  
Markey  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Pearce

## NOT VOTING—8

Bilbray  
Eshoo  
Giffords

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1618

Mr. TURNER changed his vote from  
“aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 83, noes 338, not voting 11, as follows:

Pelosi  
Perlmuter  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rivera  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Ross (FL)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano

Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southernland  
Speier  
Stark  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Webster  
Welch  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

[Roll No. 424]

## AYES—83

Adams	Garrett	Mulvaney
Amash	Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Bachmann	Gohmert	Nunes
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte	Paul
Benishek	Gowdy	Pence
Bilbray	Graves (GA)	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Black	Hensarling	Pompeo
Blackburn	Herger	Price (GA)
Bono Mack	Huizenga (MI)	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Roskam
Brooks	Hurt	Royce
Broun (GA)	Issa	Ryan (WI)
Buerkle	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Scott (SC)
Campbell	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Lamborn	Sessions
Chabot	Landry	Stearns
Chaffetz	Latta	Stutzman
Coble	Long	Walberg
Coffman (CO)	Lummis	Walsh (IL)
Duncan (SC)	Mack	West
Flake	Manzullo	Westmoreland
Fleischmann	McClintock	Mica
Fleming	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)

## NOES—338

Ackerman	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Aderholt	Critz	Hayworth
Akin	Crowley	Heck
Alexander	Cuellar	Heinrich
Altmire	Culberson	Herrera Beutler
Andrews	Cummings	Higgins
Austria	Davis (CA)	Himes
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hinche
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Hinojosa
Baldwin	DeFazio	Hirono
Barletta	DeGette	Hochul
Barrow	DeLauro	Holden
Bartlett	Denham	Holt
Bass (CA)	Dent	Honda
Bass (NH)	DesJarlais	Hoyer
Becerra	Deutch	Huelskamp
Berg	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Berkley	Dicks	Inslee
Berman	Dingell	Israel
Biggett	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Bilirakis	Dold	Jackson Lee
Bishop (GA)	Donnelly (IN)	(TX)
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Jenkins
Blumenauer	Dreier	Johnson (GA)
Bonner	Duffy	Johnson (IL)
Boren	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, E. B.
Boswell	Edwards	Jones
Boustany	Ellmers	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	Emerson	Keating
Braley (IA)	Engel	Kelly
Brown (FL)	Farenthold	Kildee
Buchanan	Farr	Kind
Bucshon	Fattah	King (IA)
Butterfield	Filner	King (NY)
Calvert	Fincher	Kingston
Camp	Fitzpatrick	Kinzinger (IL)
Canseco	Flores	Kissell
Capito	Forbes	Kline
Capps	Fortenberry	Kucinich
Capuano	Frank (MA)	Lance
Cardoza	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Carnahan	Fudge	Lankford
Carney	Gallegly	Larsen (WA)
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Larson (CT)
Carter	Gerlach	Latham
Cassidy	Gibbs	LaTourette
Castor (FL)	Gibson	Lee (CA)
Chandler	Gonzalez	Levin
Chu	Gosar	Lewis (CA)
Cicilline	Granger	Lewis (GA)
Clarke (MI)	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	LoBiondo
Clay	Green, Gene	Loebsack
Cleaver	Griffin (AR)	Lofgren, Zoe
Clyburn	Grijalva	Lowe
Cohen	Grimm	Lucas
Cole	Guinta	Luetkemeyer
Conaway	Guthrie	Lujan
Connolly (VA)	Gutierrez	Lungren, Daniel
Conyers	Hall	E.
Cooper	Hanabusa	Lynch
Costa	Hanna	Maloney
Costello	Harper	Marchant
Courtney	Harris	Marino
Cravaack	Hartzler	Markey
Crawford	Hastings (FL)	Matheson

Matsui	Posey	Shuster
McCarthy (CA)	Price (NC)	Simpson
McCarthy (NY)	Quayle	Sires
McCaul	Quigley	Smith (NE)
McCollum	Rahall	Smith (NJ)
McCotter	Reed	Smith (TX)
McDermott	Rehberg	Smith (WA)
McGovern	Reichert	Southerland
McIntyre	Renacci	Speier
McKeon	Reyes	Stark
McKinley	Ribble	Sutton
McMorris	Richardson	Terry
Rodgers	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
McNerney	Rigell	Thompson (MS)
Meehan	Rivera	Thompson (PA)
Meeks	Roby	Thornberry
Michaud	Roe (TN)	Tiberi
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Tierney
Miller (NC)	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
Miller, George	Rogers (MI)	Tonko
Moore	Rooney	Towns
Moran	Ros-Lehtinen	Tsongas
Murphy (CT)	Ross (AR)	Turner
Murphy	Ross (FL)	Upton
Nadler	Rothman (NJ)	Van Hollen
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Neal	Runyan	Visclosky
Neugebauer	Ruppersberger	Walden
Noem	Rush	Walz (MN)
Nugent	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Nunnelee	Sanchez, Linda	Schultz
Olson	T.	Waters
Oliver	Sanchez, Loretta	Watt
Owens	Sarbanes	Webster
Palazzo	Schakowsky	Welch
Pallone	Schiff	Whitfield
Pascrell	Schilling	Wilson (FL)
Pastor (AZ)	Schmidt	Wittman
Paulsen	Schrock	Wolf
Payne	Schrader	Womack
Pearce	Schwartz	Woolsey
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Wu
Perlmutter	Scott, Austin	Yarmuth
Peters	Scott, David	Yoder
Peterson	Serrano	Young (FL)
Pingree (ME)	Sewell	Young (IN)
Platts	Sherman	
Poe (TX)	Shinkus	
Polis	Shuler	

## NOT VOTING—11

Ellison	McHenry	Stivers
Eshoo	Rangel	Sullivan
Gardner	Rokita	Weiner
Giffords	Slaughter	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1621

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 125, noes 298, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

## AYES—125

Adams	Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Amash	Green, Gene	Nugent
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Nunes
Bartlett	Grimm	Paul
Barton (TX)	Harris	Paulsen
Benishek	Heinrich	Pence
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Peters
Bishop (UT)	Herger	Petri
Black	Herrera Beutler	Pitts
Blackburn	Hochul	Polis
Bono Mack	Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Price (GA)
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Quayle
Bucshon	Hurt	Ribble
Buerkle	Inslee	Rigell
Burgess	Issa	Roe (TN)
Burton (IN)	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Campbell	Jordan	Rooney
Cantor	King (NY)	Roskam
Chabot	Kline	Ross (FL)
Chaffetz	Labrador	Royce
Coble	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Coffman (CO)	Landry	Scalise
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Schweikert
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Scott (SC)
Doggett	Long	Scott, Austin
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (TN)	Lungren, Daniel	Sessions
Fitzpatrick	E.	Smith (WA)
Flake	Mack	Stearns
Fleischmann	Manzullo	Stutzman
Fleming	Matheson	Terry
Foxx	McCarthy (CA)	Walberg
Franks (AZ)	McClintock	Walsh (IL)
Gallegly	McCotter	Westmoreland
Garrett	McHenry	Wilson (SC)
Gibson	McKeon	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Mica	Yoder
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Gosar	Miller, Gary	Young (FL)
Gowdy	Mulvaney	Young (IN)

## NOES—298

Ackerman	Clyburn	Gibbs
Aderholt	Cohen	Gohmert
Akin	Cole	Gonzalez
Alexander	Conaway	Granger
Altmire	Connolly (VA)	Graves (MO)
Andrews	Conyers	Green, Al
Austria	Costa	Griffin (AR)
Baca	Costello	Grijalva
Bachus	Courtney	Guinta
Baldwin	Cravaack	Guthrie
Barletta	Crawford	Gutierrez
Barrow	Crenshaw	Hall
Bass (CA)	Critz	Hanabusa
Bass (NH)	Crowley	Hanna
Becerra	Cuellar	Harper
Berg	Culberson	Hartzler
Berkley	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Davis (CA)	Hastings (WA)
Biggett	Davis (IL)	Hayworth
Bilbray	Davis (KY)	Heck
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Higgins
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Himes
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hinche
Bonner	Denham	Hinojosa
Boren	DesJarlais	Hirono
Boswell	Deutch	Holden
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Holt
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Honda
Braley (IA)	Dingell	Hoyer
Brooks	Dold	Huelskamp
Brown (FL)	Donnelly (IN)	Israel
Buchanan	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Butterfield	Dreier	Jackson Lee
Camp	Duffy	(TX)
Canseco	Edwards	Jenkins
Capito	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Capps	Ellmers	Johnson (IL)
Capuano	Emerson	Johnson, E. B.
Cardoza	Engel	Jones
Carnahan	Farenthold	Kaptur
Carney	Farr	Keating
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Kelly
Carter	Filner	Kildee
Cassidy	Fincher	Kind
Castor (FL)	Flores	King (IA)
Chandler	Forbes	Kingston
Chu	Fortenberry	Kinzinger (IL)
Cicilline	Frelinghuysen	Kissell
Clarke (MI)	Fudge	Kucinich
Clarke (NY)	Garamendi	Lance
Clay	Gardner	Langevin
Cleaver	Gerlach	Lankford

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1624

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CLARKE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 142, noes 282, not voting 8, as follows:

Adams	Carder	Franks (AZ)
Ademholt	Cassidy	Frelinghuysen
Akin	Chabot	Galleghy
Alexander	Chaffetz	Gardner
Altmire	Cleaver	Garrett
Amash	Clyburn	Gerlach
Austria	Coble	Gibbs
Bachmann	Coffman (CO)	Gonzalez
Bachus	Conaway	Goodlatte
Barletta	Costa	Gosar
Barrow	Costello	Gowdy
Bartlett	Courtney	Granger
Barton (TX)	Cravaack	Graves (GA)
Bass (NH)	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Berg	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Biggert	Cuellar	Griffin (AR)
Bilbray	Culberson	Griffith (VA)
Bilirakis	Davis (CA)	Grimm
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Guinta
Bishop (NY)	Denham	Guthrie
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Hall
Black	DesJarlais	Harper
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Blumenauer	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Bonner	Dold	Hastings (WA)
Boren	Donnelly (IN)	Hayworth
Boswell	Doyle	Heck
Boustany	Dreier	Hensarling
Brady (PA)	Duffy	Herger
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Herrera Beutler
Brooks	Duncan (TN)	Hinojosa
Broun (GA)	Edwards	Huelskamp
Buchanan	Ellmers	Huizenga (MI)
Bucshon	Emerson	Hultgren
Buerkle	Farenthold	Hunter
Burgess	Farr	Hurt
Calvert	Fincher	Israel
Camp	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Campbell	Flake	Jackson (IL)
Canseco	Fleischmann	Jenkins
Cantor	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Capuano	Flores	Jordan
Cardoza	Forbes	Kelly
Carney	Fortenberry	Kind
Carson (IN)	Fox	King (IA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1628

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 318, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

## AYES—107

Adams	Gohmert	Nugent
Amash	Goodlatte	Nunes
Bachmann	Gosar	Paul
Bachus	Gowdy	Paulsen
Bartlett	Graves (GA)	Pence
Barton (TX)	Graves (MO)	Perlmutter
Benishek	Griffith (VA)	Peters
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Petri
Black	Himes	Polis
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)
Bono Mack	Hultgren	Quayle
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rigell
Brooks	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Buerkle	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Burgess	Jones	Ross (FL)
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Royce
Campbell	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Labrador	Scalise
Chabot	Lamborn	Schweikert
Chaffetz	Landry	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Long	Sensenbrenner
Cooper	Lummis	Sessions
Cummings	Mack	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Manzullo	Stearns
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Stutzman
Duncan (TN)	Matheson	Tiberi
Farenthold	McCarthy (CA)	Walberg
Flake	McClintock	Walsh (IL)
Fleischmann	McHenry	West
Fleming	McKeon	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Mica	Woodall
Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Yoder
Garrett	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Gerlach	Mulvaney	Young (IN)
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)	

## NOES—318

Ackerman	Connolly (VA)	Guinta
Aderholt	Conyers	Guthrie
Akin	Costa	Gutierrez
Alexander	Costello	Hall
Altmire	Courtney	Hanabusa
Andrews	Cravaack	Hanna
Austria	Crawford	Harper
Baca	Crenshaw	Harris
Baldwin	Critz	Hartzler
Barletta	Crowley	Hastings (FL)
Barrow	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)
Bass (CA)	Culberson	Hayworth
Bass (NH)	Davis (CA)	Heck
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Heinrich
Berg	Davis (KY)	Herger
Berkley	DeFazio	Herrera Beutler
Berman	DeGette	Higgins
Biggert	DeLauro	Hinche
Bilbray	Denham	Hinojosa
Bilirakis	Dent	Hirono
Bishop (GA)	DesJarlais	Hochul
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Holden
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Holt
Bonner	Dicks	Honda
Boren	Dingell	Hoyer
Boswell	Dold	Huelskamp
Boustany	Donnelly (IN)	Inslee
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Israel
Braley (IA)	Dreier	Issa
Brown (FL)	Duffy	Jackson (IL)
Buchanan	Edwards	Jackson Lee
Bucshon	Ellison	(TX)
Butterfield	Ellmers	Jenkins
Calvert	Emerson	Johnson (GA)
Camp	Engel	Johnson (IL)
Canseco	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Capito	Fattah	Kaptur
Capps	Filner	Keating
Capuano	Fincher	Kelly
Cardoza	Fitzpatrick	Kildee
Carnahan	Flores	Kind
Carney	Forbes	King (IA)
Carson (IN)	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Carter	Frank (MA)	Kingston
Cassidy	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger (IL)
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Kissell
Chandler	Gallely	Kucinich
Chu	Garamendi	Lance
Ciilline	Gardner	Langevin
Clarke (MI)	Gibbs	Lankford
Clarke (NY)	Gibson	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Gonzalez	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Granger	Latham
Clyburn	Green, Al	LaTourrette
Coble	Green, Gene	Latta
Cohen	Griffin (AR)	Lee (CA)
Cole	Grijalva	Levin
Conaway	Grimm	Lewis (CA)

Lewis (GA)	Payne	Sewell
Lipinski	Pearce	Sherman
LoBiondo	Pelosi	Shimkus
Loebach	Peterson	Shuler
Lofgren, Zoe	Pingree (ME)	Shuster
Lowe	Pitts	Simpson
Lucas	Platts	Sires
Luetkemeyer	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)
Lujan	Pompeo	Smith (NJ)
Lungren, Daniel	Posey	Smith (TX)
E.	Price (NC)	Southerland
Lynch	Quigley	Speier
Maloney	Rahall	Stark
Marino	Reed	Sullivan
Markey	Rehberg	Sutton
Matsui	Reichert	Terry
McCarthy (NY)	Renacci	Thompson (CA)
McCaul	Reyes	Thompson (MS)
McCollum	Ribble	Thompson (PA)
McCotter	Richardson	Thornberry
McDermott	Richmond	Tierney
McGovern	Rivera	Tipton
McIntyre	Roby	Tonko
McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Towns
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Tsongas
Rodgers	Rogers (MI)	Turner
McNerney	Rooney	Upton
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Van Hollen
Meeks	Ross (AR)	Velázquez
Michaud	Rothman (NJ)	Visclosky
Miller (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Walden
Miller (NC)	Runyan	Walz (MN)
Miller, George	Ruppersberger	Wasserman
Moore	Rush	Schultz
Moran	Ryan (OH)	Waters
Murphy (CT)	Sánchez, Linda	Watt
Myrick	T.	Waxman
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Webster
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Welch
Neal	Schakowsky	Westmoreland
Neugebauer	Schiff	Whitfield
Noem	Schilling	Wilson (FL)
Nunnelee	Schmidt	Wittman
Olson	Schock	Wolf
Oliver	Schrader	Womack
Owens	Schwartz	Woolsey
Palazzo	Scott (VA)	Wu
Pallone	Scott, Austin	Yarmuth
Pascarell	Scott, David	Young (FL)
Pastor (AZ)	Serrano	

## NOT VOTING—7

Eshoo	Rokita	Weiner
Giffords	Slaughter	
Rangel	Stivers	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair (during the vote).  
One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1631

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. RICHARDSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 224, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

## AYES—200

Ackerman	Baca	Bass (CA)
Altmire	Baldwin	Bass (NH)
Andrews	Barrow	Becerra

Benishek	Grijalva	Oliver
Berkley	Grimm	Pallone
Berman	Gutierrez	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Hanna	Payne
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Boren	Hayworth	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Heck	Peters
Braley (IA)	Heinrich	Platts
Brown (FL)	Herger	Polis
Butterfield	Higgins	Price (NC)
Capito	Himes	Quigley
Capps	Hinche	Rahall
Capuano	Hinojosa	Reyes
Carnahan	Hirono	Richardson
Carney	Hochul	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Holt	Rivera
Castor (FL)	Honda	Rohrabacher
Chandler	Hoyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Chu	Inslee	Ross (AR)
Ciilline	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)
Clarke (MI)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Coffman (CO)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Keating	T.
Connolly (VA)	Kelly	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cooper	Kind	Schakowsky
Costello	Kissell	Schiff
Courtney	Kucinich	Schrader
Critz	Langevin	Schwartz
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Levin	Sewell
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
DeGette	Lipinski	Shuster
DeLauro	LoBiondo	Sires
Dent	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Deutch	Lowey	Speier
Diaz-Balart	Lujan	Stark
Dicks	Lynch	Sutton
Dingell	Maloney	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Manzullo	Thompson (MS)
Dold	Marchant	Tierney
Donnelly (IN)	Marino	Tonko
Doyle	Markey	Towns
Ellison	Matheson	Tsongas
Emerson	Matsui	Van Hollen
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Velázquez
Farr	McCollum	Visclosky
Fattah	McDermott	Wasserman
Filner	McGovern	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	McNerney	Waters
Fortenberry	Meehan	Watt
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Waxman
Fudge	Moore	Welch
Garamendi	Moran	West
Gerlach	Murphy (CT)	Wilson (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Wu
Gonzalez	Nadler	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Napolitano	Young (AK)
Green, Gene	Neal	

## NOES—224

Adams	Canseco	Forbes
Aderholt	Cantor	Foxx
Akin	Cardoza	Franks (AZ)
Alexander	Carter	Frelinghuysen
Amash	Cassidy	Gallely
Austria	Chabot	Gardner
Bachmann	Chaffetz	Garrett
Bachus	Clyburn	Gibbs
Barletta	Coble	Gibson
Bartlett	Cole	Gohmert
Barton (TX)	Conaway	Goodlatte
Berg	Costa	Gosar
Biggert	Cravaack	Gowdy
Bilbray	Crawford	Granger
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Black	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Blackburn	Davis (KY)	Griffith (VA)
Bonner	Denham	Guinta
Bono Mack	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Boswell	Dreier	Hall
Boustany	Duffy	Harper
Brooks	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Buchanan	Edwards	Hastings (WA)
Bucshon	Ellmers	Hensarling
Buerkle	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Burgess	Fincher	Holden
Burton (IN)	Flake	Huelskamp
Calvert	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
Camp	Fleming	Hultgren
Campbell	Flores	Hunter

Hurt Miller (FL) Scalise  
 Israel Miller (MI) Schilling  
 Issa Miller, Gary Schmidt  
 Jenkins Miller, George Schock  
 Johnson (IL) Mulvaney Schweikert  
 Johnson (OH) Myrick Scott (SC)  
 Johnson, Sam Neugebauer Scott, Austin  
 Jones Noem Sensenbrenner  
 Jordan Nugent  
 King (IA) Nunes  
 King (NY) Nunnelee  
 Kingston Olson  
 Kinzinger (IL) Owens  
 Kline Palazzo  
 Labrador Paul  
 Lamborn Paulsen  
 Lance Pearce  
 Landry Pence  
 Lankford Peterson  
 Latham Petri  
 LaTourette Pingree (ME)  
 Latta Pitts  
 Lewis (CA) Poe (TX)  
 Loeb sack Pompeo  
 Long Posey  
 Lucas Price (GA)  
 Luetkemeyer Quayle  
 Lummis Reed  
 Lungren, Daniel Rehberg  
 E. Reichert  
 Mack Renacci  
 McCarthy (CA) Ribble  
 McCaul Rigell  
 McClintock Roby  
 McCotter Roe (TN)  
 McHenry Rogers (AL)  
 McIntyre Rogers (KY)  
 McKeon Rogers (MI)  
 McKinley Rooney  
 McMorris Roskam  
 Rodgers Ross (FL)  
 Meeks Royce  
 Mica Runyan  
 Michaud Ryan (WI)

## NOT VOTING—8

Brady (TX) Rangel Stivers  
 Eshoo Rokita Weiner  
 Giffords Slaughter

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1634

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on amendment A offered by the  
 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR)  
 on which further proceedings were  
 postponed and on which the noes pre-  
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 139, noes 285,  
 not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—139

Adams Black Burgess  
 Akin Blackburn Burton (IN)  
 Amash Boren Calvert  
 Bachmann Boswell Campbell  
 Barletta Brady (TX) Canseco  
 Bartlett Brooks Chabot  
 Barton (TX) Broun (GA) Chaffetz  
 Benishek Buchanan Coble  
 Bishop (UT) Buerkle Coffman (CO)

Conaway Johnson (OH) Posey  
 Cooper Johnson, Sam Quayle  
 Cravaack Jones Reed  
 Duffy Jordan Renacci  
 Duncan (SC) King (IA) Richardson  
 Duncan (TN) Kline Rogers (MI)  
 Ellmers Lamborn Rooney  
 Farenthold Landry Roskam  
 Flake Lankford Ross (FL)  
 Fleischmann Latta Royce  
 Fleming Luetkemeyer Ryan (WI)  
 Flores Luján Scalise  
 Foxx Lummis Schilling  
 Franks (AZ) Mack Schmidt  
 Gardner Manzullo Schock  
 Gibbs Marchant Schrader  
 Gibson Marino Schweikert  
 Gingrey (GA) McClintock Scott (SC)  
 Gohmert McHenry Scott, Austin  
 Gonzalez McIntyre Sensenbrenner  
 Goodlatte McKinley Sessions  
 Gosar Mica Shimkus  
 Gowdy Miller (FL) Shuster  
 Graves (GA) Miller, Gary Simpson  
 Griffith (VA) Mulvaney Southerland  
 Guinta Murphy (PA) Stearns  
 Harper Neugebauer Stutzman  
 Harris Nugent Sullivan  
 Hartzler Nunes Terry  
 Heinrich Olson Owens  
 Hensarling Paul  
 Hinchey Paulsen  
 Hinojosa Hochul  
 Huhul Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren Petri  
 Hunter Pitts  
 Hurt Pompeo

## NOES—285

Ackerman Critz Himes  
 Aderholt Hirono Crowley  
 Alexander Cuellar Holden  
 Altmi re Culberson Holt  
 Andrews Cummings Honda  
 Austria Davis (CA) Hoyer  
 Baca Davis (IL) Huelskamp  
 Bachus Davis (KY) Inslee  
 Baldwin DeFazio Israel  
 Barrow DeGette Issa  
 Bass (CA) DeLauro Jackson (IL)  
 Bass (NH) Denham Jackson Lee  
 Becerra Dent (TX)  
 Berg DesJarlais Jenkins  
 Berkley Deutch Johnson (GA)  
 Berman Diaz-Balart Johnson (IL)  
 Biggert Dicks Johnson, E. B.  
 Bilbray Dingell Kaptur  
 Bilirakis Doggett Keating  
 Bishop (GA) Dold Kelly  
 Bishop (NY) Donnelly (IN) Kildee  
 Blumenauer Doyle Kind  
 Bonner Dreier King (NY)  
 Bono Mack Edwards Kingston  
 Boustany Ellison Kinzinger (IL)  
 Brady (PA) Emerson Kissell  
 Braley (IA) Engel Kucinich  
 Brown (FL) Farr Labrador  
 Bucshon Fattah Lance  
 Butterfield Filner Langevin  
 Camp Fincher Larsen (WA)  
 Cantor Fitzpatrick Larson (CT)  
 Capito Forbes Latham  
 Capps Fortenberry LaTourette  
 Capuano Frank (MA) Lee (CA)  
 Cardoza Frelinghuysen Levin  
 Carnahan Fudge Lewis (CA)  
 Carney Gallegly Lewis (GA)  
 Carson (IN) Garamendi Lipinski  
 Carter Garrett LoBiondo  
 Cassidy Gerlach Loeb sack  
 Castor (FL) Granger Loftgren, Zoe  
 Chandler Graves (MO) Long  
 Chu Green, Al Lowey  
 Cicilline Green, Gene Lucas  
 Clarke (MI) Griffin (AR) Lungren, Daniel  
 Clarke (NY) Grijalva E.  
 Clay Grimm Lynch  
 Cleaver Guthrie Maloney  
 Clyburn Gutierrez Markey  
 Cohen Hall Matheson  
 Cole Hanabusa Matsui  
 Connolly (VA) Hanna McCarthy (CA)  
 Conyers Hastings (FL) McCarthy (NY)  
 Costa Hastings (WA) McCaul  
 Costello Hayworth McCollum  
 Courtney Heck McCotter  
 Crawford Herrera Beutler McDermott  
 Crenshaw Higgins McGovern

McKeon Reichert Stark  
 McMorris Reyes Sutton  
 Rodgers Ribble Thompson (CA)  
 McNeerney Richmond Thompson (MS)  
 Meehan Rigell Thompson (PA)  
 Meeks Rivera Thornberry  
 Michaud Roby Tiberi  
 Miller (MI) Roe (TN) Tierney  
 Miller (NC) Rogers (AL) Tonko  
 Miller, George Rogers (KY) Towns  
 Moore Rohrabacher Tsongas  
 Moran Ros-Lehtinen Turner  
 Murphy (CT) Ross (AR) Upton  
 Myrick Rothman (NJ) Van Hollen  
 Nadler Roybal-Allard Velázquez  
 Napolitano Runyan Visclosky  
 Neal Ruppertsberger Walden  
 Noem Rush Walz (MN)  
 Nunnelee Ryan (OH) Wasserman  
 Olver Sánchez, Linda Schultz  
 Palazzo T. Waters  
 Pallone Sanchez, Loretta Watt  
 Pascrell Sarbanes Waxman  
 Pastor (AZ) Schakowsky Welch  
 Payne Schiff West  
 Pelosi Schwartz Whitfield  
 Perlmutter Scott (VA) Wilson (FL)  
 Peters Scott, David Wilson (SC)  
 Peterson Serrano Wittman  
 Pingree (ME) Sewell Wolf  
 Platts Sherman Womack  
 Poe (TX) Shuler Woolsey  
 Polis Sires Wu  
 Price (GA) Smith (NE) Yarmuth  
 Price (NC) Smith (NJ) Young (AK)  
 Quigley Smith (TX) Young (FL)  
 Rahall Smith (WA) Young (IN)  
 Rehberg Speier

## NOT VOTING—8

Eshoo Rangel Stivers  
 Giffords Rokita Weiner  
 Herger Slaughter

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1637

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on amendment A offered by the  
 gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN)  
 on which further proceedings were  
 postponed and on which the noes pre-  
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 64, noes 360,  
 not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—64

Amash Duncan (SC) Huelskamp  
 Bachmann Duncan (TN) Hunter  
 Bartlett Flake Hurt  
 Black Fleming Johnson, Sam  
 Blackburn Foxx Jordan  
 Brady (TX) Franks (AZ) King (IA)  
 Brooks Garrett Lamborn  
 Broun (GA) Goodlatte Long  
 Burton (IN) Gowdy Mack  
 Campbell Graves (GA) Manzullo  
 Cantor Griffith (VA) Marchant  
 Chabot Hensarling McClintock  
 Chaffetz Herger McHenry

Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Paul  
Pence  
Petri  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Price (GA)

Rohrabacher  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner

Sessions  
Southerland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Walsh (IL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Woodall

Platts  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Quayle  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Robby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rooney  
Ros-  
Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.

Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney

Tipton  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Webster  
Welch  
West  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Womack  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

King (IA)  
Kline  
Labrador  
Lamborn  
Landry  
Lankford  
Latta  
Long  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McClintock  
McHenry  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney

Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Price (GA)  
Quayle  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Roskam  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schweikert

Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Smith (NE)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Terry  
Thornberry  
Walberg  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
Westmoreland  
Wilson (SC)  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

## NOES—360

Ackerman  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Barton (TX)  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Benishkek  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggert  
Billbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canseco  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Cole  
Conaway  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham

Dent  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garamendi  
Gardner  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating

Kelly  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kline  
Kucinich  
Labrador  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts

Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stark  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Eshoo  
Giffords  
McDermott

## NOT VOTING—8

Rangel  
Rokita  
Slaughter

Stivers  
Weiner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1641

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FOXX  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms.  
Foxx) on which further proceedings  
were postponed and on which the noes  
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE  
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 119, noes 306,  
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

## AYES—119

Adams  
Amash  
Bachmann  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Benishkek  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks  
Broun (GA)  
Buerkle  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Campbell  
Canseco  
Cantor

Carter  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Cole  
Conaway  
Culberson  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers  
Fincher  
Flake  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett  
Gibbs

Gingrey (GA)  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith (VA)  
Hall  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan

Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Austria  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barletta  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggert  
Billbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Coffman (CO)  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Denham  
Dent

## NOES—306

DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duffy  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Emerson  
Engel  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fitzpatrick  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gallegly  
Garamendi  
Gardner  
Gerlach  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Gosar  
Granger  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hultgren  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly  
Kildee

Kind  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Polis  
Posey



Price (NC) Schakowsky Tonko  
 Quigley Schiff Towns  
 Rahall Schilling Tsongas  
 Reed Schmidt Turner  
 Rehberg Schock Upton  
 Reichert Schrader Van Hollen  
 Reyes Schwartz Velázquez  
 Richardson Scott (VA) Visclosky  
 Richmond Scott, David Walden  
 Rigell Serrano Walz (MN)  
 Rivera Sewell Wasserman  
 Roby Sherman Schultz  
 Roe (TN) Shuler Waters  
 Rogers (AL) Shuster Watt  
 Rogers (KY) Simpson Waxman  
 Rogers (MI) Sires Welch  
 Ros-Lehtinen Smith (NJ) West  
 Ross (AR) Smith (TX) Whitfield  
 Rothman (NJ) Smith (WA) Wilson (FL)  
 Roybal-Allard Speier Wittman  
 Runyan Stark Wolf  
 Ruppertsberger Sutton Womack  
 Rush Thompson (CA) Woolsey  
 Ryan (OH) Thompson (MS) Wu  
 Sánchez, Linda Thompson (PA) Yarmuth  
 T. Tiberi Young (FL)  
 Sanchez, Loretta Tierney  
 Sarbanes Tipton

## NOT VOTING—7

Eshoo Rokita Weiner  
 Giffords Slaughter Stivers  
 Rangel Stivers

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1644

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF  
 GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN)  
 on which further proceedings were  
 postponed and on which the noes pre-  
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 99, noes 324,  
 not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—99

Amash Duncan (TN) Hultgren  
 Bachmann Ellmers Hurt  
 Bartlett Farenthold Johnson (OH)  
 Barton (TX) Fincher Johnson, Sam  
 Benishek Fitzpatrick Jordan  
 Bilbray Flake Lamborn  
 Bishop (UT) Fleischmann Landry  
 Black Fleming Latta  
 Blackburn Flores Long  
 Brady (TX) Foxx Lummis  
 Brooks Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel  
 Brown (GA) Garrett E.  
 Buchanan Gingrey (GA) Mack  
 Buerkle Gohmert Manzullo  
 Burgess Goodlatte Marchant  
 Burton (IN) Gosar McClintock  
 Campbell Gowdy McHenry  
 Cantor Graves (GA) Miller (FL)  
 Chabot Green, Gene Miller, Gary  
 Chaffetz Griffith (VA) Mulvaney  
 Coffman (CO) Hall Murphy (PA)  
 Duffy Harris Pastor (AZ)  
 Duncan (SC) Hensarling Paul

Pearce  
 Pence  
 Petri  
 Price (GA)  
 Quayle  
 Ribble  
 Rigell  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rooney  
 Roskam

Ackerman

Adams  
 Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Austria  
 Baca  
 Bachus  
 Baldwin  
 Barletta  
 Barrow  
 Bass (CA)  
 Bass (NH)  
 Becerra  
 Berg  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Biggert  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonner  
 Bono Mack  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Boustany  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Bucshon  
 Butterfield  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Canseco  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carter  
 Cassidy  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chandler  
 Chu  
 Cicilline  
 Clarke (MI)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Coble  
 Cohen  
 Cole  
 Conaway  
 Connolly (VA)  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Cravaack  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Critz  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis (KY)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Deutsch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dicks  
 Dingell

## NOES—324

Doggett  
 Dold  
 Donnelly (IN)  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Emerson  
 Engel  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Frank (MA)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Fudge  
 Gallegly  
 Garamendi  
 Gardner  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gonzalez  
 Granger  
 Graves (MO)  
 Green, Al  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Grijalva  
 Grimm  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Gutierrez  
 Hanabusa  
 Hanna  
 Harper  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayworth  
 Heck  
 Heinrich  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hirono  
 Hochul  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hunter  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Issa  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly  
 Kildee  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kissell  
 Kline  
 Kucinich  
 Labrador  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Lankford  
 Larson (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latham

Terry  
 Visclosky  
 Walberg  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Webster  
 Woodall  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeback  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Luján  
 Lynch  
 Maloney  
 Marino  
 Markey  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCaul  
 McCollum  
 McCotter  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McNerney  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Mica  
 Michaud  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Myrick  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Neugebauer  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Nunnelee  
 Olson  
 Oliver  
 Owens  
 Palazzo  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Polis  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rahall  
 Reed  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Richmond  
 Rivera  
 Roby  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross (AR)

Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Runyan  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schmidt  
 Schock  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler

Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sires  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Southerland  
 Speier  
 Stark  
 Sullivan  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Tipton  
 Tonko  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Turner  
 Upton

Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Walden  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Welch  
 West  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Yarmuth  
 Yoder

## NOT VOTING—9

Eshoo LaTourette Slaughter  
 Giffords Rangel Stivers  
 Herger Rokita Weiner

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1647

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 432,  
 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been  
 present, I would have voted “aye.”

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on amendment B offered by the  
 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR)  
 on which further proceedings were  
 postponed and on which the noes pre-  
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 124, noes 300,  
 not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

AYES—124

Adams Conaway Griffin (AR)  
 Amash Cravaack Griffith (VA)  
 Bachmann Culberson Guinta  
 Bartlett Duncan (SC) Harper  
 Barton (TX) Duncan (TN) Harris  
 Benishek Ellmers Hartzler  
 Bilbray Farenthold Hastings (WA)  
 Bilirakis Fincher Hensarling  
 Bishop (UT) Fitzpatrick Herger  
 Black Flake Huelskamp  
 Blackburn Fleischmann Huizenga (MI)  
 Brady (TX) Fleming Hultgren  
 Brooks Flores Hurt  
 Brown (GA) Foxx Issa  
 Buchanan Franks (AZ) Johnson (OH)  
 Buerkle Garrett Johnson, Sam  
 Burgess Gibson Jordan  
 Burton (IN) Gingrey (GA) King (IA)  
 Campbell Gohmert Kline  
 Canseco Goodlatte Labrador  
 Chabot Gosar Lamborn  
 Chaffetz Gowdy Landry  
 Coffman (CO) Graves (GA) Lankford

Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Walberg  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
Westmoreland  
Wilson (SC)  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (IN)

## NOES—316

□ 1651

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF  
GEORGIA

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 316, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

AYES—108

Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luettkemeyer  
Luján  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaull  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Noem  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Olver  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Pitts  
Platts  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renaacci  
Reyes  
Ribble  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Rivera  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.

Sanchez, Loretta Smith (TX)  
 Sarbanes Smith (WA)  
 Schakowsky Speler  
 Schiff Stark  
 Schilling Sutton  
 Schock Terry  
 Schrader Thompson (CA)  
 Schwartz Thompson (MS)  
 Scott (VA) Thompson (PA)  
 Scott, David Thornberry  
 Serrano Tiberi  
 Sewell Tierney  
 Sherman Tipton  
 Shimkus Tonko  
 Shuler Towns  
 Shuster Tsongas  
 Simpson Turner  
 Sires Upton  
 Smith (NE) Van Hollen  
 Smith (NJ) Velázquez

Visclosky  
 Walden  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Welch  
 West  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

Price (GA)  
 Quayle  
 Ribble  
 Rigell  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rooney  
 Roskam  
 Ross (FL)  
 Royce  
 Ryan (WI)

Scalise  
 Schmidt  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (SC)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Southerland  
 Stearns  
 Stutzman

Terry  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walsh (IL)  
 Webster  
 Westmoreland  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Woodall  
 Young (FL)  
 Young (IN)

Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sires  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Stark  
 Sullivan  
 Sutton  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)

Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Tipton  
 Tonko  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz

Waters  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Welch  
 Tipton  
 Whitfield  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Upton  
 Womack  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Yarmuth  
 Yoder  
 Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—8

Eshoo Rangel Stivers  
 Giffords Rokita Weiner  
 Paul Slaughter

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is less than 1 minute remaining  
 in this vote.

□ 1655

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BROUN OF  
GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN)  
 on which further proceedings were  
 postponed and on which the noes pre-  
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 120, noes 303,  
 not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

## AYES—120

Adams Duncan (TN) Johnson (OH)  
 Amash Ellmers Johnson, Sam  
 Bachmann Farenthold Jordan  
 Bartlett Flake Kline  
 Barton (TX) Fleischmann Labrador  
 Benishek Fleming Lamborn  
 Bilbray Flores Landry  
 Bishop (UT) Foxx Latta  
 Black Franks (AZ) Long  
 Blackburn Garrett Lummis  
 Bono Mack Gingley (GA) Mack  
 Boustany Gohmert Manzanillo  
 Brady (TX) Goodlatte Marchant  
 Brooks Gosar McCarthy (CA)  
 Broun (GA) Gowdy McClintock  
 Buerkle Graves (GA) McHenry  
 Burton (IN) Graves (MO) Mica  
 Campbell Griffith (VA) Miller (FL)  
 Canseco Guinta Miller, Gary  
 Cantor Hall Mulvaney  
 Cassidy Harper Murphy (PA)  
 Chabot Harris Myrick  
 Chaffetz Hastings (WA) Neugebauer  
 Coble Hensarling Nugent  
 Coffman (CO) Herger Nunes  
 Conaway Huizenga (MI) Pence  
 Cravaack Hultgren Petri  
 Culberson Hunter Pitts  
 Duffy Hurt Poe (TX)  
 Duncan (SC) Issa Pompeo

Ackerman  
 Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Austria  
 Baca  
 Bachus  
 Baldwin  
 Barletta  
 Barrow  
 Bass (CA)  
 Bass (NH)  
 Becerra  
 Berg  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Biggert  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (NY)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonner  
 Boren  
 Boswell  
 Brady (PA)  
 Braley (IA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Buchanan  
 Bucshon  
 Burgess  
 Butterfield  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cardoza  
 Carnahan  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carter  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chandler  
 Chu  
 Cicilline  
 Clarke (MI)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Cole  
 Connolly (VA)  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Critz  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis (KY)  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro  
 Deham  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Deutsch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Dold  
 Donnelly (IN)  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Edwards  
 Emerson  
 Engel

## NOES—303

Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Frank (MA)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Fudge  
 Gallegly  
 Garamendi  
 Gardner  
 Gerlach  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gonzalez  
 Granger  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Griffin (AR)  
 Grijalva  
 Grimm  
 Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Noem  
 Nunnelee  
 Olson  
 Olver  
 Owens  
 Palazzo  
 Pallone  
 Pascarell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pearce  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Platts  
 Polis  
 Posey  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rahall  
 Reed  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Richmond  
 Rivera  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross (AR)  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Runyan  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schilling  
 Schock  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell

Maloney  
 Marino  
 Markey  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCaul  
 McCollum  
 McCotter  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McNeerney  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Michaud  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Moore  
 Moran  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Noem  
 Nunnelee  
 Olson  
 Olver  
 Owens  
 Palazzo  
 Pallone  
 Pascarell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pearce  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Platts  
 Polis  
 Posey  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rahall  
 Reed  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Reyes  
 Richardson  
 Richmond  
 Rivera  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross (AR)  
 Rothman (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Runyan  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schilling  
 Schock  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell

## NOT VOTING—9

Ellison Paul  
 Eshoo Rangel Stivers  
 Giffords Rokita Weiner

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining in this  
 vote.

□ 1659

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS)  
 on which further proceedings were  
 postponed and on which the noes pre-  
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 164, noes 257,  
 not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

## AYES—164

Adams Davis (KY) Hensarling  
 Aderholt Denham Herger  
 Amash DesJarlais Huelskamp  
 Austria Duffy Huizenga (MI)  
 Bachmann Duncan (SC) Hultgren  
 Barletta Duncan (TN) Hunter  
 Bartlett Ellmers Hurt  
 Barton (TX) Farenthold Issa  
 Benishek Fincher Jenkins  
 Black Flake Johnson (OH)  
 Blackburn Fleischmann Johnson, Sam  
 Boustany Flores Jones  
 Brady (TX) Forbes Jordan  
 Brooks Foxx Kelly  
 Broun (GA) Gallegly King (IA)  
 Buchanan Gardner Kinzinger (IL)  
 Bucshon Garrett Kline  
 Buerkle Gibbs Labrador  
 Burgess Gingley (GA) Lamborn  
 Calvert Gohmert Landry  
 Camp Goodlatte Latta  
 Campbell Gosar Lewis (CA)  
 Canseco Gowdy Long  
 Capito Granger Lucas  
 Carter Graves (GA) Luetkemeyer  
 Cassidy Graves (MO) Lummis  
 Chabot Green, Gene Lungren, Daniel  
 Chaffetz Griffin (AR) E.  
 Coble Griffith (VA) Mack  
 Coffman (CO) Grimm Manzanillo  
 Cole Guinta McCarthy (CA)  
 Conaway Guthrie McClintock  
 Crawford Hall McHenry  
 Crenshaw Harris McKinley  
 Culberson Hartzler Mica

Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Nugent  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pastor (AZ)  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Quayle

Rahall  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Rooney  
Roskam  
Ross (FL)  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Schweikert  
Scott (SC)  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions

Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Southernland  
Stearns  
Stutzman  
Sullivan  
Thornberry  
Tipton  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walsh (IL)  
Webster  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Young (AK)

Stark  
Sutton  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tonko  
Towns

Tsongas  
Turner  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters

Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
West  
Wilson (FL)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—11

Burton (IN)  
Eshoo  
Giffords  
Keating

Paul  
Rangel  
Rokita  
Slaughter

Stivers  
Weiner  
Young (IN)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1702

Mr. JONES changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, and 436. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall vote Nos. 420, 422, 426, and 428. I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote Nos. 421, 423, 424, 425, 427, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, and 436. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the permanent RECORD immediately following this vote.

Mr. LANCE. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. MYRICK). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANCE. The language of section 740 is within the jurisdiction of the Energy and Commerce Committee, on which I serve, and our committee is the appropriate forum for considering such language. Having said that, the House should know—and the Food and Drug Administration should know—that we agree with the spirit of the language and the goal of the members of the Appropriations Committee, who supported its inclusion in the bill.

After speaking with the sponsors of the language, we know that together we share a concern about what is happening at the FDA. We believe that policy decisions at the FDA should be based on science and not on any irrelevant consideration.

As much as officials at the FDA claim that their decisions are based on sound science, their recent actions give us pause. For example, 2 months ago, Chairman UPTON, along with Chairman LUCAS and Chairman GRAVES, sent a letter to the FDA regarding the potential ban of antimicrobial animal drugs and the lack of scientific support for that action. This potential ban has caused significant worry among our Nation's producers, veterinarians, and consumers. The chairmen finally received a response from the FDA last Friday, and the FDA refused to answer the questions about the scientific basis of their action, claiming that the mat-

ter is still, quote, under consideration. This response is unacceptable and makes us wonder why the FDA refuses to discuss the scientific basis for its conclusions.

We pledge that the Energy and Commerce Committee will explore whether there are steps that Congress should take to prevent the FDA from pursuing regulatory actions that are not based on sound scientific analysis and fact. Those at the FDA should know that many in Congress are watching and carefully studying whether the FDA's actions are justified.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REHBERG. I rise to speak briefly about the language that is about to be stricken from this bill, which has come to be called the “hard science amendment.” I offered this language in committee on behalf of ranchers in Montana. They sat across the table from me and shared the significant concerns they have over the lack of a scientific basis being used by the FDA in developing rules and regulations affecting their ranches and the livestock industry. For me, this isn't faceless regulation. The consequences of these regulations have faces. They wear cowboy boots.

Agriculture is the number one industry in Montana. The State raises 2.6 million cows and calves annually, 180,000 hogs and pigs, 230,000 sheep, and I know of at least 600 goats. The cattle industry alone is responsible for \$1.4 billion in sales every year.

Ranchers in Montana and across the United States have a strong incentive to preserve a healthy food supply for the American public, and that means making sure their animals are healthy. The use of antibiotics in livestock significantly improves the health of animals, which in turn lowers the risk of food borne illnesses which may show up later in the process.

FDA has refused to release risk assessments on the impacts antibiotics may have on humans who consume these meats. And while they have not released any credible evidence to support their efforts, FDA bureaucrats are still pushing ranchers to remove these valuable antibiotics from livestock production. This is of grave concern to Montana ranchers, and I will keep fighting alongside Montana producers to get this problem addressed. In fact, I would like to submit letters from those organizations into the RECORD.

I hope to work with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee as well as the Energy and Commerce Committee to work with FDA in order to ensure that they examine the facts before moving forward with regulations that will significantly impact Montana's number one industry.

## NOES—257

Ackerman  
Akin  
Alexander  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bass (CA)  
Bass (NH)  
Becerra  
Berg  
Berkley  
Berman  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Billirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boren  
Boswell  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Cantor  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clarke (MI)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cravaack  
Critz  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Emerson  
Engel

Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleming  
Fortenberry  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Garamendi  
Gerlach  
Gibson  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Heck  
Heinrich  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hochul  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Kildee  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kissell  
Kucinich  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maloney  
Marchant  
Marino  
Markey  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McCollum

McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Murphy (CT)  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Noem  
Nunes  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Platts  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Reed  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Richmond  
Rivera  
Roby  
Rogers (AL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross (AR)  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schilling  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schwartz  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier

NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S  
BEEF ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, June 14, 2011.

Hon. DENNY REHBERG,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REHBERG: On behalf of the membership of the National Cattlemen's Beef Association (NCBA), I want to thank you for your amendment during the House Appropriations Committee markup of the Fiscal Year 2012 Agriculture Appropriations Bill which would require the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to use hard science in its regulatory actions. For years now, the beef industry has seen many rules, regulations, and guidances that have been based on personal agendas and political science rather than hard facts and data. As such, NCBA supports your amendment and will work to keep it in the underlying bill.

The FDA has a huge impact on America's cattle producers. From drug approvals and regulation, to feed and some foods safety activities, our industry finds itself dealing more and more with FDA. We believe that FDA has a role to help our industry and to help keep our consumers safe, but we have seen repeated attempts to strip cattle producers of the use of fully tested and approved drugs and technologies. The attack on ranchers' use of antibiotics to prevent and treat disease in cattle is one of many instances.

It is time that Congress exercised its right to perform regulatory oversight of Federal agencies, and your amendment will go far in calling attention to the concerns we have with FDA. It is our hope that FDA will heed this message and return to using risk assessments, facts, and widely accepted peer reviewed data in its regulatory decisions, rather than allowing activist groups and some administration officials to drive their personal and skewed views of science, food production, and regulation.

Thank you for your efforts and we look forward to helping you work to maintain this language in the bill.

Sincerely,

BILL DONALD,  
President.

MONTANA PORK,  
PRODUCERS COUNCIL,  
Jordan, MT, June 14, 2011.

Hon. DENNY REHBERG,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REHBERG: Montana's pork industry, including over 48 Hutterite colonies engaged in a wide range of agricultural operations, strongly support of your amendment to the FY12 Appropriations Bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, which urges the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to give the greatest weight to readily available hard science data in making critical policy decisions. The Montana Pork Producers Council needs to science to come first in a wide range of jurisdiction involving food supply, especially when such determinations have the potential to affect Montana's agricultural communities.

Montana's growing isowean market is testament to the care provided to pigs here, in this case from birth to weaning, and their disease-free status. We currently have 3 large barns supplying pigs throughout the Midwest. The state's isolation plays a distinct role in this, but so does a responsible health program. Each year our producers have met with your staff to discuss issues affecting the care and well-being of their pigs, their communities and their consumers. We strongly feel your commitment to these concerns is expressed in your amendment to the FY12 Appropriations Bill.

Antibiotics have been used to treat, control, and prevent disease or promote growth in animals for more than 50 years. Existing FDA regulations ensure adequate safeguards against antibiotic resistance, and all of the animal drugs the pork industry can utilize today have undergone rigorous FDA review to ensure their safety for livestock, humans, and the environment. Any regulatory decisions or legislative action on antibiotic use in animals must be transparent and made based on sound science and scientific risk analysis. Recently, some in Congress and the FDA have attempted to dismantle long-standing and effective industry practices with regard to antibiotic use without a scientific and risk based approach, putting animal health and well-being and pork producers' livelihoods at risk without any proven benefit to human health.

As our Representative, we ask that you continue to fight for our industry and voice our concerns to FDA. We work daily to produce safe and wholesome pork products for the American consumer, and we do so using scientifically proven techniques and innovative technologies. Overly expansive regulation of antibiotics based on an unproven scientific theory promoted by certain advocacy groups not only will undo long-standing, effective production practices but will jeopardize the collaborative relationship the pork industry has with FDA.

MPPC appreciates your support of the U.S. pork industry and we thank you for championing this cause in the FY12 Appropriations Bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. Please let us know if there is anything we can do to move this issue forward.

Sincerely,

ANNE L. MILLER,  
Executive Director.

NATIONAL PORK  
PRODUCERS COUNCIL,  
Washington, DC, June 2, 2011.

Hon. DENNY REHBERG,  
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office  
Building, Washington, DC, 20515

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE REHBERG: On behalf of America's 67,000 pork producers, I write in support of your amendment to the FY12 Appropriations Bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, which urges the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to give the greatest weight to readily available hard science data in making critical policy decisions. The National Pork Producers Council (NPPC) thanks you for your focus on the need to allow science to dictate this nation's policy decisions on antibiotic use in pork production.

As you know, America's pork producers are strongly committed to providing for the well-being of their animals and to raising them in a humane and compassionate manner. We depend on safe and effective animal health products to maintain animal health, prevent animal suffering, and ensure that consumers have access to safe and wholesome pork products.

Antibiotics have been used to treat, control, and prevent disease or promote growth in animals for more than 50 years. Existing FDA regulations ensure adequate safeguards against antibiotic resistance, and all of the animal drugs the pork industry can utilize today have undergone rigorous FDA review to ensure their safety for livestock, humans, and the environment. Any regulatory decisions or legislative action on antibiotic use in animals must be transparent and made based on sound science and scientific risk analysis. Recently, some in Congress and the FDA have attempted to dismantle long-

standing and effective industry practices with regard to antibiotic use without a scientific and risk based approach, putting animal health and well-being and pork producers' livelihoods at risk without any proven benefit to human health.

We urge you to take up this issue and communicate our concerns to FDA. Our industry works daily to produce safe and wholesome pork products for the American consumer, and we do so using scientifically proven techniques and innovative technologies. Overly expansive regulation of antibiotics based on an unproven scientific theory promoted by certain advocacy groups not only will undo long-standing, effective production practices but will jeopardize the collaborative relationship the pork industry has with FDA.

NPPC appreciates your support of the U.S. pork industry and we thank you for championing this cause in the FY12 Appropriations Bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, and we look forward to working with you on this important issue.

Sincerely,

DOUG WOLF,  
President.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Chair, I would like to express my thanks to the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee and to the gentleman from New Jersey for his comments in behalf of the committee of their willingness to help find a solution to the issue that serves as the basis for this point of order, these regulations.

We have cotton, peanuts and pecans in my district, and we also have poultry. We have pork, and we have cattle operations. The decisions of the FDA have an enormous impact on the farmers in my district at many levels. Many of the producers in my district are worried about some of the conclusions that FDA seems to have reached regarding antibiotics. They're worried about what will come next. They conduct themselves every day with the best interests of their animals in mind. A healthy animal means healthy food for consumers.

If there is scientific evidence that shows that current practices are not in the interest of public health, my farmers, of course, will change their practices, but there should and there must be clear evidence. Not unnecessary regulation. Certainly with the job situation today and the state of our economy, the FDA must be very careful, very precise, and very certain that any regulatory action they take is supported by scientific evidence. I very much welcome the involvement of the authorizing committee to help find a solution to this issue.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1710

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 740. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Food and Drug Administration to write, prepare, develop or publish a proposed, interim, or final rule, regulation, or guidance that is intended to restrict the use of a substance or a compound unless the Secretary bases such rule, regulation or guidance on hard science (and not on such factors as cost and consumer behavior), and determines that the weight of toxicological evidence, epidemiological evidence, and risk assessments clearly justifies such action, including a demonstration that a product containing such substance or compound is more harmful to users than a product that does not contain such substance or compound, or in the case of pharmaceuticals, has been demonstrated by scientific study to have none of the purported benefits.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LANCE. Madam Chair, I raise a point of order. Section 740 constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill because it requires a new determination and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI of the rules of the House and should be struck from the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this section includes language requiring a new determination. The section, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the section is stricken from the bill.

Mr. FINCHER. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FINCHER. Madam Chairman, the American taxpayers are crying out for commonsense spending of Federal tax dollars and urging Congress to review those rules and regulations which may stifle innovation and job creation.

I introduced House Resolution 98, along with my colleagues from North Carolina and Tennessee, to send a bipartisan, commonsense message to the Food and Drug Administration to rely on scientific facts in its development of rules and regulations.

We are supporting this resolution now because we understand that the FDA may be contemplating some regulations in the future that may ignore hard science when creating rules regulating food, drugs, medical devices, and cosmetics, among other products. These regulations may harm industry and hinder job creation in the future.

The FDA was set up to be a science-based agency; but American farmers, people I represent in Tennessee's Eighth Congressional District, are crying out for commonsense regulations and urging Congress to review those rules and regulations which may hamper innovation and American business.

I know that the FDA is well-intentioned in their efforts. However, today's FDA is not putting science first. Instead, they are picking and choosing which scientific studies they want to use to support their original theory.

The FDA has been slowly expanding their efforts to regulate, regardless if

the science is there to back up their efforts. Therefore, I also would hope that this body would be willing to investigate all efforts, guidelines, and rules by the FDA, and review whether they followed the science to get to their decisions.

The FDA is a needed agency, but Congress also needs to do its proper due diligence of oversight to ensure American industries prosper and the American population is safe.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 741. The Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the payment rate for upland cotton under section 1103(b) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713(b)) as necessary so that reductions in the amount of direct payments made to producers for upland cotton completely offset the costs incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide payments to the Brazil Cotton Institute.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against section 741 which begins on page 78, line 8, and ends on page 78, line 15, in that it violates House rule XXI, clause 2, by changing existing law and inserting legislative language in an appropriation bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this section includes language imparting direction. The section, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the section is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 742. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that was convicted (or had an officer or agent of such corporation acting on behalf of the corporation convicted) of a felony criminal violation under any Federal or State law within the preceding 24 months.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in opposition to this bill because it puts the interests of Brazilian farmers above the very real needs of American women and children. It leaves the very next section of this bill, section 743, subject to a point of order.

As everyone knows, the Women, Infants, and Children program provides nutrition assistance grants to States for low-income, pregnant, breast-feeding, and postpartum women, infants, and children up to the age of five. It serves 9 million mothers and young children nationwide, including 58,000 in my State of Connecticut.

Nearly half of the babies born in the United States every year participate in this program. It is a short-term intervention, but it can help to provide a lifetime of good nutrition and health behaviors.

While in our subcommittee, this appropriations bill slashed WIC funding by \$650 million. That means that as many as 300,000 women and children will be turned away and forced to go hungry; and, in fact, Secretary of Agriculture Vilsack has warned our subcommittee that this number could be as high as 750,000.

To alleviate this glaring shortfall, my amendment to restore \$147 million to the WIC program, paid for with \$147 million currently provided to the Brazilian Cotton Institute, passed with a bipartisan vote during full committee consideration. But the rule for this bill arbitrarily took away the pay-for and, instead, requires that \$147 million be cut out from WIC or other programs in this bill already woefully underfunded.

What are we doing here? We are giving the money back to Brazilian farmers. The majority has decided that is more important. Where is our sense of justice to women and children in the United States?

To be sure, there are many egregious cuts in this appropriations bill and not just to WIC. Other vital nutrition programs like the Commodities Supplemental Food Program and the Emergency Food Assistance Program, school lunches, food safety, the CFTC, international food aid—all of these basic, commonsense priorities of the American people take a huge hit in this legislation, mainly so the majority can preserve oil company subsidies and tax breaks for the rich.

To their credit, even the Republicans on our committee saw this \$147 million handout to Brazilian farmers as a bridge too far. So they and Democrats alike overwhelmingly approved the transfer of these funds to WIC—until the Republican leadership stepped in and negated our vote.

We cannot be taking food out of hungry people's mouths here at home in order to subsidize overseas cotton production. It makes no sense. As my colleague Mr. FLAKE noted at the committee markup, it is quite ironic that we would subsidize Brazilian agriculture so that we can continue to excessively subsidize agriculture here.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to abide by the overwhelming vote of our subcommittee, to stand up for American women and children, and to reject this bill. This is not what we voted for and not what the American people want.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 743. None of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to provide payments (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to provide payments) to the Brazil Cotton Institute.



## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against section 743 which begins on page 78, line 24, and ends on page 79, line 2, in that it violates House rule XXI, clause 2, by changing existing law and inserting legislative language in an appropriation bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Chair, I wish to be heard.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Thank you, Madam Chair. Let me clarify what insisting on this point of order means.

It means that the amendment that Ms. DELAURO offered in committee, which was approved in the Appropriations Committee, is nullified, which means that Brazilian cotton farmers get subsidies and poor pregnant women and children do not get the money for WIC.

□ 1720

I have nothing against Brazilian cotton farmers, but Brazil's economy is doing pretty good right now.

The Rules Committee could have protected the money for WIC. The Rules Committee waived points of order against a whole bunch of stuff in this bill except for three provisions. So it wouldn't have been unusual or extraordinary for the Rules Committee to protect this provision. Many of us pleaded with the committee to do just that, to respect the work of the Appropriations Committee when it came to protecting WIC, when it came to protecting poor pregnant women and children.

Madam Chair, my friends on the other side of the aisle say all the time that they're with us in trying to cut excessive subsidies and putting the focus back on the people here in the United States who need help. This would have been an opportunity. If not now, when are we going to do this?

So, Madam Chair, I would hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would reconsider and not insist on their point of order. I think poor pregnant women and children in this country who benefit from WIC are more important right now than subsidizing Brazilian cotton farmers.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chair, I would like to speak to the point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman says, If not now, when? It is our intention to restore this at the proper place in the bill, the DeLauro amendment. I wanted to clarify that because we've discussed that, and we intend to follow through with that.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this section addresses funds in other acts. The section, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the section is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 744. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide any benefit described in section 1001D(b)(1)(C) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a(b)(1)(C)) to a person or legal entity if the average adjusted gross income of the person or legal entity exceeds \$250,000.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against section 744 which begins on page 79, line 3, and ends on page 79, line 10, in that it violates House rule XXI, clause 2, by changing existing law and inserting legislative language in an appropriation bill.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this section addresses funds in other acts. The section, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the section is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 745. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract, memorandum of understanding, or cooperative agreement with, make a grant to, or provide a loan or loan guarantee to, any corporation that any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability.

## SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 746. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MYRICK, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 15, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House,*  
*The Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to my appointment to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I hereby resign my position with the House Committee on Small Business.

It has been an honor to serve as a Member of the Committee on Small Business, and I have been proud to work hard with my colleagues to find solutions to the problems that small businesses face in America. I look forward to representing the people of the 3rd Congressional District of Tennessee as a Member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

I appreciate the opportunity to have served on the House Committee on Small Business, and I look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

CHUCK FLEISCHMANN,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 8 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 8 p.m.

□ 2005

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON) at 8 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

# AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 300 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2112.

□ 2006

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, with Mr. REED (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill had been read through page 80, line 2.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KINGSTON

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount made available by titles I through VI (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 0.78 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces certain accounts in the bill specified in the amendment by 0.78 percent, and it fulfills a commitment which the minority and the majority had discussed earlier regarding WIC funding.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. We accept the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act to the Food and Drug Administration may be used to approve any application submitted under section 512 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b) for approval of genetically engineered salmon.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my interest in here is because I am from Alaska, and we have the finest wild salmon in the world. And we have people that are trying to—and especially under NOAA and FDA—trying to approve the fact that they have genetically engineered a salmon. That's not natural.

□ 2010

And our goal is, we have a supply of natural wild salmon for the State of Alaska and for this Nation, because I think that's crucially important, especially in this day when we have all those that accuse us of having artificial things, you know, pesticides, et cetera.

This is a good amendment. It's an amendment supported by both sides of the aisle. It's not just Alaska. This is also for California, Oregon, and the rest of it. But mostly, I am the Congressman from Alaska. I think it's crucially important we understand that this should not be allowed, for the FDA to say, okay, a genetically raised salmon—I call it a Frankenstein fish—should never be allowed in our markets.

I have a group of individual Alaskans who not only make their living, but

they are proud of their product. To have this occur and be promoted by the Federal Government is wrong.

So I'm trying to save money. But I'm also saying genetically we should never allow it to happen in the fishing industry.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. It's my pleasure to join you in this amendment. I actually have the best salmon caught in the lower 48 in Monterey Bay. A history of fishing in Monterey, used to be the sardine capital of the world. We're very sensitive to the fact that people are trying to mess around with the natural process and the Food and Drug Administration is set to approve genetically engineered salmon through a process the FDA uses to approve new drugs for animals. There's something wrong with the fact that in the approval process our food is now treated the same as animal drugs.

If approved, genetically engineered salmon would be the first genetically modified animal allowed onto the American dinner plate. Approval of genetically engineered salmon poses serious threats to human health, our fishing communities, and our wildlife stock fish.

They have no long-term studies on the safety of genetically engineered fish. There could be grave, unintended consequences on human health. Preliminary studies show that the compounds in genetically engineered salmon may be linked to cancer and severe drug allergies.

We've seen that the dominant method of raising salmon in other parts of the world is an open net, these pens in the ocean, and farmed fish escape these facilities every year. The impact of genetically engineered salmon escaping could be detrimental to wild stocks. The list goes on and on and on.

Our fishing communities are already facing challenges, and genetically engineered salmon would have an additional effect of lowering wild salmon prices, as already seen with normal farmed salmon. Lower prices, combined with declines in wild salmon stocks, would be economically detrimental to our fishermen, our fishing culture, and our coastal communities. It is unnecessary to genetically engineer salmon.

For these reasons, I support Mr. YOUNG's amendment that prohibits funds to the FDA to approve genetically engineered salmon.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I do not have the expertise that my friend from Alaska has on it, but I wanted to say this. Earlier, or actually during the markup, Mr. REHBERG offered an amendment about the FDA using sound science. And I do believe, in this case, the FDA is using

sound science in a process that was approved in January 2009, and they are going through a process right now to make sure that this product does not have a problem as respects human consumption. I think that, of course, should be the number one issue.

There are also some other considerations in terms of food supply, feeding more people, which is something that we all have debated on this bill. And also there is an issue with me about some jobs. So I'm concerned on this because it does seem like a pretty major change in my philosophy of sound science.

I yield to my friend from Alaska, who I think is out of time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the chairman.

I believe whoever has given him that information is wrong. We have a product made in the United States naturally. Why would we want someone to create a Frankenstein fish to compete against a naturally created God-given gift, and have it promoted by supposedly science?

There's no science in this. In fact, they were trying to do and say we have to feed the world with artificial means. And I'm saying, okay. Do it someplace. But don't you do it with my and our salmon.

Mr. FARR, listen to me very carefully. This is a very, very important thing because this is the greatest thing we have going, Alaskan natural wild salmon being sold in the market and the benefit, what they can do to have it replaced by a genetic Frankenstein fish. I'm saying this is wrong. All due respect to the chairman.

What science are they talking about? They have a bunch of people created by the government that's going to take and put in, I call it traps or nets, and create a fish that's fed quickly. They say it can grow quicker, we're home.

Well, what people are you talking about? Mr. DICKS, you better be listening because you catch most of my salmon. Don't you forget it. You had better stand on the floor and defend this because you're in deep trouble if you don't. I'll tell you that right now.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will please direct his comments to the Chair.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I don't know all the ins and outs of this, but I do know that we're constantly getting on the FDA to use more sound science, less politics, and to have more transparency, and it appears that that's what they're doing here. And they may come out against genetically modified salmon, but they are just looking at it right now to determine.

And with respect to the food supply, if you could safely produce genetically modified fish, you could feed a great portion of the world with it. So I have some concerns on it, but I did want to oppose the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of my colleague from Alaska, Mr. YOUNG's amendment to prohibit funding for the

Food and Drug Administration to approve genetically engineered salmon.

The FDA is considering an application to sell patented genetically engineered salmon for human consumption. This fish would be given a gene from an eel-like Pout fish and a growth hormone from the Pacific Chinook salmon, which would allow it to grow twice as fast as traditional Atlantic salmon.

If the FDA approves the request, it would be the first genetically engineered animal approved for human consumption, and it would open the door for many more.

Unfortunately, the FDA evaluation process has lacked transparency, failing to provide the public adequate information or sufficient time to provide comment or express concern. And a recent poll found that 91 percent of Americans oppose FDA approval of genetically engineered animals for human consumption.

Mr. Chair, I'm also concerned about the potential commercial impact of G.E. salmon. Salmon fishermen in my district and many others along the Pacific coast have been devastated in recent years by fishery closures. Last year's salmon season was limited to just 8 days because of the continued steep decline in the salmon population.

Because G.E. salmon are more sexually aggressive and resistant to environmental toxins, their escape would pose a catastrophic threat to wild salmon populations.

If just 60 of these G.E. fish find their way into a population of sixty thousand wild salmon, the wild species would fade into extinction in a matter of decades.

While its producer claims that genetically engineered salmon would be sterile, FDA's own documents show that five percent of this G.E. salmon would, in fact, be able to reproduce.

Each year, millions of farmed salmon escape from open-water nets, threatening wild fish populations. Even if a small number of fertile G.E. salmon spilled into nature, our wild salmon and fisherman would be suffering the consequences for years to come—possibly for evermore.

I want to thank my good friend DON YOUNG for his hard work on this important issue and his leadership as co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Wild Salmon . . . even though he considers my salmon "bait" for his fishers.

I look forward to continuing to work with him and other concerned colleagues to protect our natural fisheries and stop this "frankenfish."

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. For consumer safety, for the purity of our waters, and for the continued viability of our fishing industry . . . we must block funding for the FDA to approve genetically engineered salmon.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PINGREE OF MAINE

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used (1) to provide electronic notifications to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives on travel relating to any "know your farmer, know your food" initiatives or (2) in contravention of the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative priority research area specified in subsection (b)(2)(F) of the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act (7 U.S.C. 450i).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chair, this amendment would combat the misguided report language written to attack local and regional food systems. By passing this amendment, we will send an important message to farmers, consumers, and community leaders around the country: Local and regional food systems are critically important. They provide economic opportunities for rural communities and healthy food for consumers.

Local food systems are the backbone of economies across the country. In order to ensure local food systems work to their maximum potential, Congress must support research, thriving programs, and devote more, not less, funding to enhance this work.

You know, no matter what group I'm talking to, whether it's members of the credit unions or realtors or teachers, when I start talking about improving the quality of food we serve our kids, improving local food systems, and knowing where your food comes from, I look around the room and everybody is nodding. Across the board, these issues are important to people, and this is where there is real energy for growth in the economy.

The language included in the report was designed to criticize and hamstring efforts that are underway at the USDA to create jobs, to increase farm income, and to bolster the economy through the development of local and regional food systems. The language targets local and regional food system development in two ways:

First, it demands overly burdensome reporting requirements of the USDA's Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food initiative. USDA developed this initiative to streamline the implementation of existing programs authorized by Congress in the last farm bill.

□ 2020

"Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food" is not a standalone program and does not have its own budget. Creating additional burdensome reporting requirements would delay program implementation and distract the USDA from addressing the economic challenges of rural communities.

Second, the report language expresses concern with USDA research, education, and extension activities associated with local and regional food systems through the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative, AFRI.

While Congress sets broad research policies for USDA, Congress does not usually dictate what research USDA

cannot do; nor does Congress usually substitute its opinion of what's good science for the professional judgments of competitive grant peer review panels. By singling out a small piece of the agricultural research agenda and by substituting the committee's judgment for that of researchers and educators, the Agriculture appropriations bill report sets up a roadblock to innovation and diversity in American agriculture and growth in the rural economy.

In response to this misguided report language, this amendment will prohibit the USDA from using funds to fulfill the additional and burdensome reporting requirements proposed for Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food. The amendment would also prohibit USDA from using funds to carry out activities contrary to the current research priorities that Congress established in the last farm bill.

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to say it's time to cut budgets and reduce deficits. I also believe in fiscal responsibility. This is not about fiscal discipline; this is about priorities.

Last year, we spent a staggering \$548 billion to fund the Department of Defense and an equally unbelievable \$158 billion on continued operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. By comparison, the entire Agriculture Department is funded with 20 percent of what we spend on defense, and the research priorities we are talking about in this amendment are funded with one-half of 1 percent of the total agriculture budget.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting farmers, in supporting local food production, and consumers who want to know where their food comes from. It's good for our local communities, our local economies, and it's good for our country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I don't quite understand what the problem is with the bill language at all.

Here's what it does: the report language, which this amendment tries to strike, it simply tells the Secretary of USDA to notify the committee of any trips related to the Know Your Farmer initiative and include the agenda and the cost to the American taxpayers. It doesn't prevent them from doing this. It simply says let us know. It also says put this information on the Web page. So if Know Your Farmer is that important, why would USDA have any opposition to this at all? In fact, I don't know that USDA does.

I also want to say that, as somebody who represents rural southeast Georgia, there is this nostalgic idea that somehow the further food travels the more evil it becomes. But if you look at a plate of fresh vegetables that you

may have eaten sometime today, that food traveled a long way. In fact, asparagus travels a long way. Lettuce—my friend, Mr. FARR, gave me an article earlier today. I think 59 percent of the lettuce in America comes from his one district.

Now, if we start confining that to Monterey County, it might be great for the folks in Monterey County, but I don't mind eating California lettuce because if the California farmers can do it for less money and I can get lettuce year round for less money, that's not a bad thing. So I think some of the assumption that food traveling is a bad idea, I think it's flawed in itself.

But I want to get back to this bill report language. It simply says to the USDA, let us know how much you're going to spend. And why is that so important? I want my friend from California to know that if you look through the USDA budget request for FY12, there's not one mention of Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food. It's an initiative. There has not been a budget request for it. If there was a budget request for it for \$3 million or \$30 million, then we could have something we could be debating about.

But what it is, is an initiative; and all we're asking is, if you go forward with this—and we don't stop them from going forward with it—we're just saying we want to know how much it's going to cost. So I do not believe that it's bad report language at all, and I strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I strongly support this amendment because the language in the bill—I'm going to read it to you. It's one paragraph, but it's the most draconian language because we've never done this before ever in an ag bill. It says: "The committee directs the Department to provide an electronic notification to the committee at least 72 hours prior to any travel in support of the Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food initiative, and such notification shall include the agenda of the entire trip along with the cost to U.S. taxpayers. Additionally, the committee directs the Department to post media advisories for all such trips on its Web site, and that such advisories include the same information."

My God, we don't do this to know your soldier, to know your veteran, to know your school teacher, to know anybody else that's in the public service, to know your law enforcement officer; and yet they're doing this for Know Your Farmer?

This program, as Mr. KINGSTON pointed out, we just had the ag report come out and I'm very proud that one county in my district does \$4 billion worth of agriculture, as pointed out in that report, that grows 59 percent of all the

lettuce consumed in the United States in one county in California that I represent. Part of that is this program now that they're doing, which is Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food.

Consumers can go with their cell phones into a grocery store; and because of the barcode there, they can ZIP it and it immediately comes up the farmer who grew that food saying this is who I am and this is where I grew it and this is how many days it takes to get to you, and all the things you might want to—if we're going to educate people about nutrition, I can't think of a more exciting way to do it.

And to require that the Department has to essentially do this gestapo, looking at every time you move you have to report to a higher authority on your initiative and on your entire trip and the agenda and cost, we don't do that for anybody else in the Federal Government, and I don't think we should do it for our farmers or for our members of the U.S. Department of Agriculture who are supporting our farmers.

So I support this amendment very strongly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any Know Your Farmer, Know Your Food initiative of the Department of Agriculture.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, it's very interesting that I came into the Chamber at this time because my amendment also has to do with Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food.

I am very concerned about this program because it is not an authorized program by the Congress. I am very concerned that we have our executive branch off doing all kinds of things that it has no business doing, from fighting wars to running programs that they weren't authorized to run.

This program, in my opinion, conducts duplicative marketing methods by taking funds from programs that already exist within USDA through

grants and program management activities.

□ 2030

All of these entities within the USDA already have marketing tools to reach out to applicants in the local community and work with them. Programs that issue grants from USDA would not be affected or lose a single cent of funding from my amendment. Let me repeat: Grants and program management activities from USDA do not lose a cent of funding under my amendment. Rather, it would strike the redundant Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food effort by the USDA to advertise their programs and ensure that the money in the grants and in the program management activities would be spent on the activities that are authorized. My staff has been told by people at the USDA that grant issuing and farmer and consumer programs will continue to operate as normal without this duplicative effort.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of erroneous information put out there in relation to my amendment, and I would like to take some time to clear it up.

It doesn't affect any USDA grant or program management funds already existing because Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food does not issue grants. Nor does it manage any programs. But it is a circumvention of the authority and defeats the intent of Congress when we are the ones who should be authorizing programs and budgets. So I think that this is a program that we do not need, and I believe that it should be abolished, because when the USDA wants a program, it should be coming to the Congress to get authorization for that program.

There is a specific violation against establishing a program in the authorization that would have set up slush funds in the Secretary's office, and I think this is similar to that. It allows the department to take money from existing programs, put it into this program, and spend them the way that they wish to, and I don't think that is an appropriate expenditure of funding that we have authorized.

Therefore, I urge passage of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition because I cannot, for the life of me, understand why you are so afraid of Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food. They say, well, we need to have this program authorized. My god, we went to war without authorizing it. We spent all that money, and half the people don't even question it. And you want to question Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food?

I think this is a direct attack on the White House initiative, which is about

nutrition, which is about trying to get people—I mean, we talked about this yesterday, about how you have places in this country that are food deserts. You have places where there are no grocery stores. There are 7-Elevens. They don't have fresh fruits and vegetables. People can't go down to a local store and find fresh fruits and vegetables.

So what do we do? This committee puts money into the USDA to help farmers markets get established in these tough areas, to encourage farmers to come in, and at the same time teach people who have never shopped for fresh fruits and vegetables, never been to a farmers market.

We have actually tied in, in my district, the issuing of food stamps and WIC vouchers so that they will spend them right there, and 65 percent of the income that comes to the farmers at the farmers markets comes from them.

So this is all part of the initiatives to get people to know about agriculture. Milk doesn't come from a carton. Food doesn't come from a grocery store. It gets grown somewhere by a farmer, he and his wife. And we are trying to get kids to know something about agriculture. We are putting in school gardens. All of this is part of Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food, and you want to strike it.

What is this? Is this some kind of conspiracy that you are afraid of? People might learn a little bit about where food comes from in America, and there is organic food and that you have choices and you just don't have to eat everything that is packaged and processed and full of salts and sugars and additives and preservatives?

What are we afraid of? What are we afraid of? My God, to strike it, or tell the department that they can't do this, I think it is not in our best intentions, and it is not smart nutrition.

We are trying to get people, I know, because I am trying to lose weight and it is a very hard thing to change your character, to change your eating habits. Unless we do that, we are going to grow a lot of Americans who aren't going to be very healthy because they don't know their farmer and they don't know their food. And if you strike this ability for the department to go out and do that kind of outreach, we are going to have a less healthy America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. You know, we in this Congress or Congresses of the past have ceded a lot of our authority to executive agencies. We have given them lots of power to regulate. They are taking over and doing an awful lot. Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food is another example of an agency going beyond what needs to be done and is something I feel they should come back to Congress for.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from Texas for yielding to me, and I want to respond to our colleague from California.

I am not afraid of a program. I am afraid, as my colleague from Texas has indicated, of the executive branch continuing to overstep its bounds and develop programs that have no authorization and do the things that it has no business doing without authorization from Congress.

I find it interesting that my colleague would bring up the fact that we went to war without authorization. I believe that was his President who did that, and I voted resoundingly not to do that.

I also want to sympathize with my colleague from California. I am certainly doing my best to lose weight, too. I think it is a struggle that most of us, particularly in this body, have. But I can tell you that I am not looking to the Department of Agriculture to give me my nutrition information. I know how to find that nutrition information, and I think most Americans know how to do that, and we don't need a special program in the Department of Agriculture to do that.

We have got to commit to bringing government spending under control, and we are going to do everything that we can. While no money will be cut from the appropriations by this amendment, it removes a program that is not authorized that gives part of the Department of Agriculture an argument for why they need money.

I think that in many cases what happens in these executive branch departments is that when their own entity begins to lose its need for being, they begin to look out there for. What is the latest trend? What can we do in this Department to justify our existence? I think that that is what happens in many, many cases, and you get the continuation. As Ronald Reagan said, the nearest thing to immortality is a Federal Government program, and I think that is what happens in many departments, not just the Department of Agriculture.

I have great respect for much of what the Department of Agriculture does, and I think it is providing vital services in many areas. But, again, this is not an area that we need the Federal Government to be involved in. We don't need this program.

Frankly, my colleague asked me what I am afraid of the program for. What I don't understand is why our colleague from Maine doesn't want reporting from this program. He didn't ask her that question. Why is she concerned that we ask for reporting mechanisms? Because we have asked the Department. How much money are you spending on this program? They cannot answer. What effect are you having? They cannot answer. There are no results. There is no cost-benefit analysis.

It is time that any program that says, We can't tell you how much we are spending; we can't tell you what we

are doing; we can't tell you if we are having any effect, to be done away with. And any program that answers a Member of Congress that way should be immediately eliminated.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Reclaiming my time for just a second, I too am trying to lose weight and would much prefer to work with my doctor and trainer than the USDA.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to engage a little bit more in this conversation that we had, both about the previous amendment and about my good friend from North Carolina's concern about this particular program called Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food.

□ 2040

I have the great privilege of serving on the Agriculture Committee. I've heard the Secretary speak to us about his interest in increasing the number of farms in our country, in getting to know our farmers better, and in making sure people have more knowledge about where their food comes from.

I have to just stand back and say for a minute that it's after 8:30 on a busy night. We're still in the middle of debating this bill at a time when our economy is in peril, when we have huge challenges before us, when we are at war in two countries. I just personally have to say I am baffled about why we are even having this debate. I was baffled about why this report language would be there that slows down research on local farming, that tries to stop a program that's not even funded, and that coordinates a lot of good efforts going on in the Department of Agriculture.

I will say, I kind of think back to the way I look at our country. We were based on agriculture and farming. I had the good fortune to be born in Minnesota even though I represent Maine. Both sets of my grandparents were Scandinavian immigrants. They came because there was rich farmland, beautiful opportunities. My grandfather was a dairy farmer. My uncle was a dairy farmer. My cousin still runs a farm and works with livestock. I went to college to study agriculture, and I own my own farm today.

So I think about, isn't this what America is all about—knowing your farmer? knowing where your food came from? understanding what the basic principles are of growing and of using our land? What in the world are we talking about? It's as if black is white and white is black and as if everything is turned upside down.

I grew up in Minnesota and Maine. Both States have a rich farming heritage. We couldn't be more proud of the families and of the people who work hard on the land. We couldn't be more proud of having vigorous farmers' markets, of having people who are able to

go to a farm stand and say to the farmer, "How did you grow this? What's behind this? Tell me about what's growing in your field." I mean, this is America. This is how our country was built.

If there is one tragedy that's going on today, it's the reduction in the number of farms and in the families who can no longer hold onto their farms, whose mortgages are being foreclosed on, who don't have enough markets. If there is anything the Secretary is telling us it is that we want more people to know about their farms, that we want to have local access to farming, that we want to have people come to farmers' markets.

I spend a lot of time visiting school cafeterias, and many of the schools in my district are very engaged with buying food locally. They realize that, if they're going to deal with childhood obesity, one of the things they have to do is get kids to eat more vegetables. One thing that really works is to have those young people know the farmers, and many schools have little gardens out back.

I visited Longfellow Elementary School in Portland, Maine, just recently. Those kids have a little plot of carrots. It's not that every lunch has one of those carrots on the menu, but it's for those kids to say, "I grew a carrot, and now I want to eat more of them." I was at the Bonny Eagle Middle School. They have a little greenhouse. I sat down to eat with those kids, and they were eating kale, kale and garlic; and they were proudly showing it off to me about how they grow kale, about how they know where it comes from. Many of them have visited with farmers. They've seen the farmers come down the road.

I can't possibly imagine why anyone would want to put language in that says you have to strike a program like this that's not even funded, that's just a way of the Secretary saying this is a good American tradition. It's a tradition in North Carolina, I am sure, where people are proud of their farmers and, in Maine, where we are exceptionally proud of the fact that the average age of our farmer is going down. We have more young people who want to go into farming. We have more and more acreage going into farming, which is a reversal of the trend that has been going on in our country for a long time. This is good for our health, and it's good for our environment. Fundamentally, this is a jobs bill, and that's what we're supposed to be here talking about. Every young person who has an opportunity to go into farming today and every family that gets to hang onto a family farm increases the number of jobs that are going on in our country.

What do we want this to turn into, big corporate agriculture where everything has to be trucked around the world?—where our carrots come from Brazil and our strawberries come from somewhere else in South America and

where we buy our food from China? I mean this is America. This is a tradition of our country. How could we possibly think that anything is wrong with promoting or researching local foods and having a program that just coordinates it all?

Ms. FOXX. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Absolutely not. As much as I appreciate my colleague from North Carolina, I'm not giving up one second to talk about the fact that in my State, we are proud of our farmers. We are proud of our big farms that grow potatoes and blueberries and that grow apples. We are proud of our fishermen, and we are proud of the fact that more young people want to get into farming.

There are more markets for farming than there ever were before today. Part of it is because people like to buy their food locally because they are so excited about the opportunity of going to a farm stand where you actually see the farmer, where you see how it's grown, where you feel comfortable about what goes into your food, where you know how it was slaughtered, where you know so much more about it, where we're raising our kids to say, "You know what? Vegetables are good for you," and here they are right in front of you.

I can't possibly imagine why this report language was there in the first place, why my colleague would want to strike everything about Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure I answer this question, because I'm hearing from our colleague that she can't possibly imagine why we are against the program. We are against it because it's not authorized.

The President of the United States is now bombing in Libya. By the way, I voted with the Kucinich amendment because I feel very uncomfortable with an unauthorized bombing as the use of force in Libya. The Federal Government frequently obligates the taxpayers to new programs. Yet the United States Congress hasn't had an opportunity to vet these programs or to vote on them, so I, myself, don't understand why that is a problem that we can have this transparency.

Now, as I've listened to this, I've kind of felt, well, Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food is one of these harmless little Washington sort of "feel good about things" initiatives, but I'm beginning to think it's just one big databank. I don't know why the USDA needs to know all of this information about the farmers. I'm wondering about that. If we want to help farmers—and I've had the opportunity of representing lots of farmers for a long

time—I'm going to give you seven things that I thought about in just sitting here during the course of the last speech.

Number one: This administration has declared war on the community banks, which are the fiber and the heart of small communities. That's where farmers get their loans. Farmers need credit. We need stability and banking laws to help farmers.

Number two: We need consistent regulations and regulations that don't send the EPA out on the farm to play "I gotcha." You may know right now, Mr. Chairman, that for organic chickens—and I know my friend from California probably knows this—you have the FDA requiring that they be raised on a slab of concrete and the USDA saying, no, they can't be. So we have two Federal agencies with two different regulations for one product. Farmers need regulatory consistency.

Number three: We need an H-2A program. Absolutely, we've got to get labor out there and a good guest worker program that works.

Number four: We need free trade agreements. We have had sitting on the desk of the White House free trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama, and this administration won't move them. That will create lots of markets for farmers.

Number five: We need estate tax relief. If you want to keep the family farm in the family, then get rid of the death tax so that it can be passed on to the next generation.

Number six: You need to have a good crop insurance program. More than any other farm program, farmers want a good crop insurance program.

Number seven: We need to cut the red tape out so that you can get to your local market. If you're a local farmer, it is impossible to sell right now to your local high school because of many Federal regulations. The small farmers can't compete with the big folks on this.

I want to say this about apples because the gentlewoman had mentioned apples. The average apples travel right now 2,500 miles to get to the consumer. Now, I don't find that horrible. We are a country of origin labeling laws, which our committee has debated for over a decade, and I don't know that it has made the world a better place. I think that consumers are actually driven by food safety, food taste and food price, and whether it comes from New York or whether it comes from the farmer down the street, those still are going to be the driving factors in making the decision. Carrots come 2,000 miles.

I would challenge my friends to look at Google food mileage and look at how much common, everyday food travels to get to your plate. What has it done? It has made America healthier. It has given us an abundant food supply, and it has given us a less expensive food supply.

But if we are serious about growing mom and pop farms—and I want to say



this to my friend from Maine—I am very interested in working with her on that. The seven things that I have listed, I can promise you, in any poll, farmers will choose before they choose to say what we really need to get farmers going in America is this program that is not authorized by the Congress, called Know Your Farmer.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. FARR. I move to strike the last word.

I just want to point out that this amendment doesn't save one penny.

□ 2050

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to strike the last word?

Mr. KINGSTON. Reserving my right to object, I just want to remind my friend about taking two bites of the 2,500-mile apple. I certainly do not object but—

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the ranking member, the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR. This amendment doesn't save one penny. Ironically, we just returned from the White House summer congressional picnic, and people ate food there. At every table, it listed where the food came from. Indeed, I remember because I went to the ice cream place and there was a stack of honey that came from the White House, that has a White House label on it, and it's a gift that the First Lady gives to visiting dignitaries from around the world as a sample of American honey grown at the White House. We just experienced Know Your Farmer—Know Your Food not more than an hour ago.

This amendment does nothing but be mean.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, I just want to point out, also at the White House picnic, if you walked far enough down, you could see the garden with fresh vegetables and everything that was being grown. It had a label about what was what.

Again, I just don't see what the harm is here if they're taking it out of existing funds. I always thought that the farmers of America were supported on a bipartisan basis in this Congress and that we like to know who our farmers are. So I agree with the gentleman, and I hope we can defeat this ill-considered amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the directive in the committee report instructing the Food and Nutrition Service to issue a new proposed rule on implementing new national nutrition standards for the school breakfast and school lunch programs in the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to accompany H.R. 2112 of the 112th Congress (House Report 112-101).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, for some families—too many, as a matter of fact—the meals served at school may be the only decent meal that their children get that day. Especially during this current economic downturn, with many Americans barely getting by, more people are relying on school meals to keep their children fed and ready to learn.

Why, then, is the Republican majority trying to turn back the clock on school nutrition? Why are they trying to undermine the quality of school meals by gumming up a regulatory process that is designed to ensure that our kids are eating healthy?

Mr. Chairman, I'm offering this amendment because it will stop the majority's attempt to block the implementation of scientific standards for school meals.

Here's the backstory. Since the Truman administration, Congress and the United States Department of Agriculture have set standards for school lunches and breakfasts. But for most of that history, those standards have not reflected the expertise of nutritionists and other health professionals.

Then, last year, Congress passed and the President signed a bill directing the USDA to make school meal requirements, for the first time, consistent with sound science and dietary guidelines issued by the Institute of Medicine. The bottom line: That would mean healthier food for our kids. It would mean the cafeteria line would have more fruits and vegetables, more whole grains and low-fat milk, and less sodium and saturated fat. As instructed by the law that we passed, USDA wrote a regulation and received over 130,000 comments.

Now, just when the process is wrapping up, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to use report language in this appropriations bill to

scrap the rule and compel USDA to write a completely new one. This is a stall tactic, plain and simple. Better school meals must not, can't be, from this act, a priority for the other side of the aisle. They apparently don't believe we need to do anything about the epidemic of childhood obesity that is rapidly becoming a major public health crisis, so they're looking for any way to put on the breaks.

The process has worked. We've had congressional direction and we've had mandates. We've had open comment period and rulemaking based on sound science. But the end result is not to the majority's liking, so they want a do-over. This is not only unnecessary, Mr. Chairman, but expensive, as there would be costs associated with starting the rulemaking over—going back to square one. In one fell swoop, the Republicans are showing themselves to be anti-science, anti-child, anti-public health, and anti-fiscal responsibility.

My amendment would stop their shortsighted and irresponsible scheme. It would prevent funds made available by this appropriations act from being used to require USDA to reissue a new rule.

Important advocates agree with me. My amendment has been endorsed by the National Education Association, the American Dietetic Association, Bread for the World, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, and many other groups, which I will include in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, our children need balanced, healthy, nutritious meals, not costly bureaucratic delays. They need this to help them succeed in school and in life.

H.R. 2112, AMENDMENT NO. 20, LIST OF SUPPORTERS

The American Academy of Pediatrics, American Dietetic Association, American Public Health Association, Association of State & Territorial Public Health Nutrition Directors, Bread for the World, California Association of Nutrition & Activity Programs, California Food Policy Advocates, Campaign to End Obesity Action Fund, Center for Science in the Public Interest, Community Food Security Coalition, Food Research & Action Center (FRAC), Jewish Council for Public Affairs, National Education Association, National Farm to School Network, The National WIC Association, Public Health Institute, Trust for America's Health, The United Fresh Produce Association.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 7XX. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance under title II of the Food for Peace Act

(7 U.S.C. 1721 et seq.) to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much.

A couple of quick points here. One, the administration is actively considering resuming food aid to North Korea. And I understand the humanitarian impulse here, but the unusual circumstances of North Korea make this a mistake—and make it a very bad mistake, frankly—which this amendment would correct.

I remember the words of one North Korean defector, Kim Duk-hong. I had a chance to talk with him. He said actually in testimony here before the committee, we must not give food aid to North Korea because it is, in his words, the same as providing funding for North Korea's nuclear program. Why is that so? Because what invariably happens is they redirect these resources into support for the regime.

This week we had reports that North Korea is making miniaturized versions of its nuclear weapons—ones that could fit atop ICBMs. That makes his statement all that more dire about the redirection of these resources into the regime's hands.

The situation in North Korea is heartbreaking. I've been up there. I've seen the depravation. But this is a disaster made by the dictatorship itself. And let me say unequivocally, the food we send does not reach the hungry.

So, who benefits from our good will? Well, the inner circle does and their military industrial complex does. We've had hearings in which the French NGO Doctors Without Borders—we're all aware of their good work around the world. They testified before the International Relations Committee that the vast majority of refugees they interview say they had never received any food aid. None of the children they had ever met had ever seen food aid during the years they worked up on the border.

And this testimony is backed up by a survey of 500 North Korean defectors in which 78.2 percent of them never saw foreign food aid. And the reason for this is because it goes, again, into the black market. It is sold for the hard currency that the regime needs for its nuclear program and other programs.

□ 2100

Some could argue that what we need is more oversight and maybe better monitoring on this food.

Let me tell you about the testimony we've heard on that, because the North Koreans, I don't think they've got a word for "transparency." No matter how airtight any monitoring protocol may be, they cheat. We had a Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission hearing where a North Korean dissident told us how the regime would mark all the houses that had received bags of food and would return to col-

lect them after the monitors had left. So North Korea is always going to cheat.

Some assert that the North is holding food, holding food for the future, hoarding a million tons of rice. That's the charge we hear from South Korea, from members of their Parliament. But the fact is that it's an asset that is converted by the North.

So I urge my colleagues to support my amendment for the sake of the North Korean people. Providing this aid not only allows Kim Jong-il's oppressive regime to divert scarce resources towards its military program, one that has grown increasingly threatening, but it also delays the day when real structural reform will come to North Korea.

There is a Korean saying that "pouring water into a cracked pot is worthless." Sending resources to Kim Jong-il is even worse. It's enabling a regime with one of the world's worst human rights records but also with an atomic bomb.

North Korea has played us like a fiddle for years. Conditions for North Koreans have only worsened. It's time for a new North Korea policy. Let's start now.

I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. We have had a very difficult time with the Food for Peace program already, and if this helps secure another supporter of the bill, we certainly would work with you on this amendment and support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. KIND

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before any short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide payments (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to provide payments) to the Brazil Cotton Institute.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward, and in a second I'm going to explain it in more detail.

For many, many years now, I and a group of bipartisan Members of this Congress have formed a coalition in an attempt to move farm bill reform forward, to try to end these large taxpayer subsidies that are going to a few,

but very large, agribusinesses, subsidies that are not in fact helping family farmers, leading to greater consolidation in production of agriculture, driving up land values, making it more difficult for new beginning farmers to enter agriculture, and subsidies that are not fiscally responsible.

In light of the budget deficits that we're wrestling with, what better time to continue to move in the area of reform under the farm bill with this Agriculture appropriation bill, rather than waiting for the promise or hope that in a year or two in the reauthorization of another farm bill that this institution might finally come around and start making the long overdue changes.

Just to show you how perverted these farm programs have gotten, recently Brazil challenged our own domestic cotton subsidy program and prevailed in the WTO court. Now you would expect our rational response would be to reform our cotton subsidy program, to come into compliance with that WTO decision, to end these subsidies that you really can't justify here to our cotton producers, and we would solve this problem.

But that's not the approach that was taken. In fact, the administration recently set up a new subsidy program that is now going to subsidize Brazil cotton producers.

Let me repeat that. We are spending \$147 million a year in order to bribe the Brazilian Government so that they don't enforce the sanctions that they're entitled to now because of our unwillingness to reform our own cotton subsidy program. That is wrong, and that is what my amendment would address. It would prohibit the use of funds through this Agriculture appropriation bill going to this new subsidy program to subsidize the Brazil cotton industry.

It just shows you what a pretzel our farm programs have turned this Congress into because of yet again the unwillingness for us to reform our own domestic title I subsidy programs. The answer to this is not to funnel out another \$147 million a year until maybe we address this in the next farm bill, which could end up costing the American taxpayer over a half a billion dollars, when we can make that correction now, reform the domestic program, get out from under the WTO decision, start saving money by not sending \$147 million a year to Brazil, and also start saving some money by reforming our own cotton domestic subsidy program.

That's the solution to this. That's something that we can fix tonight, rather than continuing this facade of maintaining these programs that many of us warned in the last farm bill would be challenged, and sure enough they did, and they're prevailing, and now they can apply economic sanctions against us.

So the time to act is now, not waiting for a year or two or whenever we're going to get around to reauthorizing

another farm bill; and the time to start saving some real money is this night, by passing the amendment that we're offering. We can save \$147 million, we can reform the cotton subsidy program and save more taxpayer dollars, and we have that ability to be fiscally responsible and start making changes tonight.

I know what the argument on the other side will be: wait for the next farm bill; we'll take care of it then. Well, there is a lot that we are moving forward on this year on deficit reduction, and I for one think that the farm bill should also be open for scrutiny for potential savings to reduce our deficit.

But that's not what's being offered tonight in reforming the title I subsidy programs. Instead, most of the deep cuts are coming under the conservation title, the nutrition programs, certain key investments that we have to make to empower our farmers to be good stewards of the land, to reduce sediment and nutrient flows and the impact it has on the quality water supply that we need in this country, the protection of wildlife habitat. In fact, three out of every four farmers applying for conservation funding assistance today are turned away because of inadequacy of funds. That number will only explode because of the deep cuts coming in these other titles of the farm bill.

We have an opportunity to start making some changes under title I, the subsidy program, first by stopping the additional layer of subsidy that's been created where we're starting to subsidize other countries' farmers. Let's start making that change tonight.

I would encourage my colleagues to look closely at this amendment. This is the reasonable response that we should be taking. Let's not defer this decision any further. We can do that. And instead of encouraging any type of trade war or sanctions with Brazil, we should move forward in reforming the cotton subsidy program starting tonight.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time and ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My colleague is very passionate, but he is also very wrong. This money does not go to Brazilian farmers. That's illegal for us to do that. What it does do, it does go to an institute that promotes Brazilian agricultural production. It may be a fine line to distinguish there, but it's inflammatory to say it's going to Brazilian farmers, that we're doing that, and he knows it and it is wrong, but it is a payment. It's a payment negotiated by the Obama administration in reaction to a loss at the WTO in order to buy time so that a trade war with our 10th largest trading partner in the world doesn't erupt that has actually nothing to do with ag protection.

The trade war that is being prevented, over \$800 million worth of exports to Brazil, protects a broad variety of nonagricultural industries in this agreement. This buys us time until the 2012 farm bill could get done. We cannot tonight nor should we tonight delve into a very complicated farm safety net program that has worked well for the American people.

It is unquestioned that the American people enjoy the safest, most abundant and cheapest food and fiber source in the world, in the developed countries; and we do that because of the hard work, sweat equity, and risk-taking of the American ag producer. They rely in turn on a safety net that is relatively complicated and interwoven across a bunch of things that make it help.

The budget that we did pass says that the farm bill will be written in 2012. I understand my colleague's disdain for the process of the Agriculture Committee. He doesn't like the Agriculture Committee, he doesn't like the work product that we come out with, but that's the group that knows the most about the process of the safety net.

□ 2110

Doing this, what the gentleman would like to do tonight, would disrupt that trade agreement and undercut the U.S. Trade Representative and his ability to negotiate around the world because he's negotiated with a group who won't stick by their word.

The 2008 farm bill put in place a 5-year contract, 5-year agreement with the American ag producers, it goes to the 2012 farm bill—2012 crop year, and we ought to stand behind it and defeat this amendment.

So the money does not go to farmers. It does protect \$800 million a year in exports of nonagricultural exports that are imported to this country, including intellectual property rights that would be abrogated if we back out of this deal that we've made with Brazil. So with that I respectfully request my colleagues to oppose the Kind amendment as being wrong-headed tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I listened to my good friend from Texas talk about deferring yet again to the Ag Committee, that somehow this payment goes to the Brazilian cotton industry and not to the cotton farmers, a distinction without a difference I would suggest.

I rise in support of my colleague from Wisconsin in this proposal. I've been in this Congress having watched three farm bill reauthorizations, and each time we find that there is expression on the floor of this Chamber for actual reform. We've asked for limitations. We are told well we just don't—the floor doesn't understand; it's too complicated. Well, it is complicated and twisted because this is an effort to try,

through the complexity, to layer efforts here that cheat the American consumer, that hurt the environment, and pose serious problems for international trade.

And my friend from Wisconsin is correct. We were talking about this in the last farm bill, and we got our comeuppance, but instead of responding responsibly in reducing or eliminating the illegal cotton subsidies, we're shoving upwards of a half-billion dollars to the Brazilian cotton industry, and I'll be prepared to argue, it benefits cotton farmers. So we're subsidizing two countries because we fail to reach our responsibilities now.

I sincerely think this is wrong. I think \$147 million could go a long way towards helping the part of American agriculture that grows food that we categorize as specialty crops who are dramatically shortchanged.

I would like to yield the remainder of my time, if I could, to my good friend from Wisconsin, the sponsor of this amendment.

Mr. KIND. Well, I thank my good friend from Oregon for his support of the amendment and for his support throughout the years in trying to lead the effort for meaningful farm bill reform.

Mr. Chairman, there is another solution to this that's going to be offered by our good friend and colleague from Arizona in just a little bit, Mr. FLAKE. He goes to the heart of the WTO decision to find out what changes we should be making in the cotton subsidy program to get out from under the thumb of Brazil, and I would support that amendment, and I hope my colleagues support his amendment as well because that is the ultimate solution to this: Instead of just cutting off the funding to Brazil right now, coming up with the cotton subsidy reform.

Now, let's remember the context in which we find ourselves this evening. Cotton payments are almost at a world record high price right now, yet these subsidies are still going out. There's just very little relationship right now with the subsidies under title I to the grain producers and cotton producers of our country and the price they receive in the marketplace. And in a time of tough budgets, when everyone else is being asked to take a haircut, whether you're a supporter of conservation programs or vital nutrition programs for our children and seniors, for us to not even look and consider the title I programs in the context of this agriculture appropriation, it's beyond the pale. There's just no justification to it.

These programs are outdated. They are impossible to justify with the American taxpayer, especially with the deficit reduction that all of us are interested in participating in this year. This is a small, but I think significant, step down the road of reform with the farm bill finding savings that can be applied to either other programs or for deficit reduction.

That's why I commend my colleague from Arizona for the amendment he's about to offer, but my friend from Oregon, too, will have some important amendments for us to consider, a payment limitation limiting the overall amount of subsidies that go to our producers. And folks, this is going to agriculture, many of whom have mailing addresses in Manhattan, in Chicago, in San Francisco. These aren't even family farmers working the land, and they're some of the primary recipients of these agriculture subsidies.

Mr. BLUMENAUER's amendments address that, along with Mr. FLAKE's AGI cutoff at \$250,000 a year. That's 250 thousand dollars of profit, and if you're an entity making a profit of over a quarter-million dollars a year, should you really still be receiving taxpayer subsidies for the business that you're running? I think not, and we'll have another opportunity to consider that later tonight.

So I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time and further explaining what this amendment is all about. And if we are serious about deficit reduction, if we are serious about reining in some of these programs that are tough to justify, then we should be serious about supporting this amendment tonight.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. And Mr. Chair, on that note I, too, commend what my friend from Wisconsin is doing. I look forward to the comments from my friend from Arizona. If we're serious about reform and saving money, it's time to move in this area.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kind amendment. I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for offering this.

You know, we've heard here that we need this program to make us trade compliant. Many of us warned when we did the last farm bill that if we did this level of subsidies that it would run afoul of our trade agreements. Yet we plowed ahead and did it anyway. And then April of last year is when our farm programs, which on their best day are out of step with reality, moved into the realm of the absurd when we hatched a program to actually fund an institute in Brazil to fund the cotton industry there to start subsidizing the Brazilians so that we could continue to subsidize our own farmers. Is that not absurd? Why are we continuing to do this?

It was raised before that we've got to do this to make us trade compliant now where tariffs might be imposed. That is true, but I offered an amendment in the committee earlier on that would have taken money from the direct payments that we currently pay to cotton farmers and paid off the Brazilians with that money rather than raid

the Treasury and raid the taxpayers once again. And guess what? That passed in committee but was stricken when it came to the floor.

So when you hear all this rhetoric about, hey, we want to be trade compliant, we could have done that. We could have simply allowed that amendment to stick in the bill, and then this would have been trade compliant. But the Brazilians would have been paid off not with new taxpayer money but with the money that is making us non-trade compliant in the first place.

So don't believe what you're hearing about, we just want to be trade compliant; that's what this is about. We offered an alternative to that, and it was rejected. And so here we are asking the taxpayers to once again this year, \$147 million to the Brazilians to make us trade compliant. We've got to stop this.

Nobody really believes that we're going to do a farm bill this year. Nobody really believes we're going to do one next year. And so we're going to be doing this year after year after year, so that means that we're going to continue to do this unless we stop it. I can tell you if we pass the Kind amendment tonight, we will be back and we'll reform our cotton subsidies in a way that will make us trade compliant. We'll go back and accept the Flake amendment that passed in the Appropriations Committee that perhaps took the money from the cotton program.

We don't need to continue to ask the taxpayers to pay off the Brazilians so that we can continue out-of-step subsidies to our own farmers. That's what this amendment is about. I commend the gentleman for offering it.

And I would yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate his support of this amendment and the leadership that he's shown not only in committee but throughout the years when it comes to sensible farm bill reform.

The easiest way for us to come into trade compliance isn't by bribing the Brazilian government to get them to not enforce the sanctions that it can under WTO; it's fixing this domestic program, and doing it now rather than waiting years from now, as my colleague just pointed out, for the next farm bill. I know this isn't easy, and I know the committees wrestles with a lot of different constituent problems. I used to serve on the committee.

I'm not asking anyone here tonight to do anything differently than what I'm asking my producers to do in my district of Wisconsin and in my State, and that's taking a haircut. The reforms that I've been proposing through the years would require my district to take a haircut on these agriculture subsidies. It's not always easy standing up to groups that are getting something from the government and saying we can't afford it, nor can we justify it, with the market and with the deficit.

But that is what it's going to take for this body to come together if we are going to be serious about deficit reduction and getting the spending under control.

□ 2120

I know that the Agriculture Committee has their hands full, and I know they would rather just defer this next decision until the next farm bill and put it off. But we don't know when that's going to be. But the thing we do know for certain is there is \$147 million going out the door every year right now that we can stop doing tonight with the passage of this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. I just want to make a point that everybody needs to take a haircut here if we are going to get this debt and deficit under control. We shouldn't ask the taxpayers once again to pay off the Brazilians so we can continue out-of-step subsidies to our own farmers.

We have a cotton industry in Arizona. They may take a hit because of this, but everybody has to take a haircut. Everybody has to contribute here to getting this deficit and this debt under control. And if we can't start with a program like this, I don't know where we'll start.

After this amendment, I plan to offer an amendment that will go after the programs that actually make us nontrade compliant. I will be glad to give up on that amendment, not offer it at all, if this amendment is allowed to pass. But if it is called for the 'noes,' then I plan to offer the amendment after this.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, you know, this is kind of a surreal debate because I don't think we're talking about the real issue here. You know, the cotton program isn't perfect. A lot of the programs that we have in the Agriculture Committee aren't perfect. Freedom to Farm, it was passed in '96. It got us into some of these problems. I opposed. It saved a little bit of money, and then we ended up spending 10 times as much money bailing people out when it collapsed. So you have got to be careful what you are doing.

But the problem here is, we're arguing about something that no longer exists. This program that they sued us under no longer exists. We have fixed it two or three times. We tried to address this. It was never good enough for the Brazilians. But we made some changes, and we made some more changes, and then we made some more changes in the 2008 farm bill. It's still not good enough for them.

Cotton went through some very difficult times. I don't have any cotton in my district. This is not a parochial

issue for me. But if they wouldn't have had that safety net, we would have been out of the cotton business. But what was going on at the same time? We had Brazil using government money to increase cotton production in Brazil. And this is something that isn't considered in the WTO because we are such geniuses that we agreed to this agreement that tied our hands and gave our competitors the ability to eat our lunch. And that's what's going on.

You know, JBS, which just took over a big part of the livestock industry in this country, is financed by the Brazilian Government. They own 30 percent of JBS. Nobody complains about that. The Brazilian Government created most of this competition that collapsed the cotton prices worldwide.

And then we agreed to let China into the WTO, and they promised that they weren't going to go into cotton production. We shipped our textile market to China and collapsed all of our textile industry. And what happened? They increased production like crazy. India increased production like crazy. Our cotton prices went down below the cost of production because of these trade agreements that we got involved in. But the way they're structured, there's nothing we can do about it. But they're going to sue us over a little step two program that we now got rid of, trying to keep our people in business.

Now, if you want to ship the whole cotton industry to Brazil and China and India, you are on a good start to doing that. And if you keep on this road, you're going to ship the rest of agriculture to these so-called developing nations that are not developing nations. If you've been to Brazil, in agriculture, they are anything but a developing nation; but they're protected under the rules that we agreed to in this WTO deal.

So is this a perfect solution? No. But we couldn't get the Brazilians to honestly sit down and work this out because they don't want to. They're trying to use this for other reasons, for other advantages in these trade negotiations and so forth. And I don't think we can ever do anything to satisfy them.

So there's more to this than people are talking about here. This is not about saving money. This is about making sure that we can have a safety net in this country so we can maintain production of agriculture in the United States and not ship it all to other countries and not get dependent on foreign countries for our food, like we've become dependent on foreign countries for our energy. That would be the worst thing that could happen to us.

So I just hope people understand all of the different ramifications. This isn't a perfect deal; but for the time being, it's probably the best solution that we can come up with.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I want to return for a moment, I think, to the focus of the discussion. I want to be absolutely clear. If this amendment passes, it will—it could incite a trade war. Brazil could immediately impose \$800 million in retaliatory tariffs on a variety of U.S. goods.

I promise you, they won't retaliate against U.S. agricultural products. They'll go after ag chemicals and biotechnology products. And they'll go after veterinarian medicines and software and books and music and films. They'll go at everybody outside of production agriculture with their \$800 billion in retaliatory tariffs.

Now, we can debate how we got here; and my colleague, the ranking member, gave a very good history of what led us to this point. But this amendment right here, right now would expose the U.S. to job-killing sanctions on goods valued at \$800 million.

In 2010, the Obama administration finalized a framework agreement with Brazil that was a critical step in resolving this dispute about the U.S. Upland Cotton Program and export credits. And, yes, under the agreement, Brazil agreed to delay trade sanctions, trade retaliation until the 2012 farm bill was developed and put together. This amendment would circumvent the legislative process in what could only be described as a haphazard way that should be a relic of the past.

This amendment is an attempt to circumvent regular order, the democratic policy process, by changing policy on an appropriation bill. Now, I can assure you, I plan and we will have a full and open process when we start the farm bill debate. We'll debate the relevant issues dealt with in this amendment.

And on that note, I would serve a notice for record that next week, we plan to start the process of conducting an audit of all farm programs. This audit is just the beginning of the comprehensive and transparent process we'll use to draft the 2012 farm bill. Policy changes will be considered carefully with the input from industry stakeholders and constituents and within the larger context of improving the competitiveness and long productivity of American agriculture.

Let's not incite a trade war. Let's return to regular order. And if nothing else, my friends, remember, this bill is 13 percent lower than the previous spending bill. This Ag approps bill takes us almost back to 2006. We are giving our share in this appropriations process. And everyone in this room knows that whether it's the regular farm bill next summer or if we have some grandiose understanding on the national debt ceiling and spending, the deficit, we could well have a farm bill dramatically quicker than next summer, and we'll have a farm bill that reflects a dramatic reduction in resources compared to past farm bills.

Let the Ag Committee in regular order craft the policy, and then when we bring it to the floor—all of our friends, expert ag economists, we all may be together—you will have your shot, as you've had before. But please don't incite a trade war. Please don't ignore the regular order of appropriation authorization. Please be rational in what you do. We've got tough decisions ahead of us. Collin and I and the rest of the committee, we know that. We're going to do what we have to do. But let us do it in regular order, not in this fashion.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Let me just say this: Georgia is the second-largest cotton-producing State. It accounts for approximately 10 percent of the U.S. cotton production. In 2011, Georgia farmers intend to plant almost 1.5 million acres of cotton.

□ 2130

The average farm-gate value is more than \$600 million. There are approximately 2,800 businesses directly involved in the production, processing, and distribution of cotton. Accounting for the broader economic effects, the Georgia cotton industry supports more than 46,000 jobs, and it generates economic activity of approximately \$11 billion.

Now, the proponents of these amendments target provisions in the cotton programs that are at the center of a WTO trade case which Brazil has against the United States. The U.S. and the Brazilian Governments have scheduled a series of consultations designed to identify the modifications in policy that will resolve the case. The intention is to reach agreement on carefully thought-out provisions that can be included in the 2012 farm bill.

These hastily drafted amendments are not guaranteed to resolve the dispute, 1, since the U.S.-Brazil consultations have not resulted in any specific agreement and, 2, since these approaches will certainly undermine the future discussions as the two countries attempt to reach a final resolution that's fair and that is reasonable.

The amendments target cotton farmers in an effort to reduce government spending. The 2008 farm bill, including the cotton provisions, was fully paid for, offset, and did not add one single dime to the deficit. They cite the years in which the government's support for cotton was historically high, but they ignore the years when the support actually is at historic lows. We need to maintain the safety net so that it's there when it's needed but not utilized, as it hasn't been recently, when it's not needed.

Farmers understand the current budget pressures. They understand that very well. But they expect to be a part

of a debate involving all of the agricultural stakeholders, and not be singled out for ad hoc budget reductions with hasty policy decisions.

These proposed amendments would nullify the basic component of cotton policy. If these amendments are enacted, they would take effect October 1, and, as a result, USDA would have to change the cotton program rules in the middle of the marketing year and change them back effective October 1, 2012. This would undermine the confidence in commodity programs, especially among agricultural lenders.

This would compromise our agriculture policy, a policy that has been vetted very carefully by our authorizing committees and relied upon by our growers and our lenders in making their business decisions going into 2012. The reauthorization of the farm bill in 2012 is the proper forum to debate the cotton agriculture policy, not here on this appropriations bill.

We have got to do what is right in regular order. This is not the time. It's not the place. And what we're doing tonight, if they go forward with this, is pulling the rug out from under our cotton farmers and our agriculture when they have made financial plans through 2012. It is unfair; it's not right, and we should not do it.

I urge my colleagues to reject these amendments. They are ill-advised.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I would like to speak in opposition to this.

The ranking member gives a great history lesson on how this comes out. The previous farm bill—passed by primarily Congress controlled by your side of the aisle—created a situation with our cotton subsidies that has caused a problem with Brazil, and we are trying to work it out.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle and many of the colleagues on the other side of the aisle are also concerned that this government as a whole, through the regulatory process, picked the regulatory agencies, making it very difficult and unpredictable for businesses by changing the regulatory environment.

Our businesses are holding back, not investing, not creating jobs. But we're about to do the same thing ourselves right here with this amendment by yanking the rug out from under our cotton farmers, who have built their businesses, made their plans based on the promise of the last farm bill.

You know, I love to save money for this government. I'm none too happy to see this money going to Brazil. But we basically lost a lawsuit and we're having to pay the damages. And we're going to fix it in the regular order without yanking the rug out from under the farmers, who are the backbone of this country, by changing the rules in the middle of the game. Give

us until next year to get that farm bill out, and we will address it.

Even though it didn't rise to the point of order, this really does rise, in my opinion, to the level of legislating within an appropriations bill.

I don't like spending the money. I don't like sending it offshore. But we cannot change the rules in the middle of the game. We cannot move the goalposts for our farmers, many of whom are small, private farmers who have built their future, taken out loans, decided to buy more land, decided to buy more equipment, based all their business decisions on the promise that this government made to them in the last farm bill. And changing the rules at this point is absolutely wrong, and I encourage my friends and my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The gentleman that preceded me said we lost a lawsuit. We didn't lose a lawsuit. If he knows anything about the WTO dispute resolution process, no conflict of interest, no open litigation, no legal proceeding as we in the United States of America understand it. A closed group with no conflict-of-interest rules that makes rulings. And they have decided that we, under this failed trade policy, should pay tribute, tribute, more than we paid to the Barbary pirates—\$147,300,000 a year to the Government of Brazil so we can subsidize our cotton farmers.

Now, you go home and explain that to your constituents. We'll borrow \$147,300,000 from China and we'll send it to Brazil so we can subsidize our cotton farmers.

What is this all about? It is about a totally failed trade policy. And at some point, this Congress has to take a stand.

RON PAUL and I, a number of years ago, 3 years ago—we get to do it once every 5 years—offered an amendment to withdraw the United States of America from the WTO. That will come up soon. I hope you'll all support it. It is something that binds us and is destroying our industries, our farmers, and everything else that's great about this country. I voted against the WTO.

This isn't about so much as a failed farm policy or farm bill, as the gentleman outlaid. It's about totally failed trade policies.

Other countries want to protect their agricultural interests. They want to feed their own people. They don't want to import polluted food from China.

We've opened up our country to polluted foods and goods from China and Brazil and everywhere else in the world with the WTO and these trade agreements. They don't observe them. We go and we lose this dispute and say, oh, we've got no choice but to pay. We have a choice. Let's not pay. We're not

going to pay the tribute. We're not going to borrow the money from China. We're not going to send it to Brazil. Let's see what they do next. And maybe we can blow up this thing called the WTO and get back to something that protects our national interests.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. I thank the gentleman for his comments in support of this amendment. And just one final point to my colleagues who have been supportive of trade agreements in the past.

Let's be honest with ourselves. If we're going to be a part of this WTO organization to establish rules of trade across borders, then let's not turn our back on an adverse decision that affects us. Let's, instead, comply and bring the cotton subsidy program into compliance. That is the answer to this. And let's end this nonsense of stacking subsidy program on top of subsidy program to just buy off and blackmail other governments who have a WTO decision in their hands.

And I cannot believe that this evening, when we're asking for huge, unprecedented cuts in conservation programs that will affect thousands of farmers throughout the country and unprecedented cuts with nutrition programs that will affect thousands of low-income families with their children, and seniors, saying, "Tough luck. We're operating under tough budget times. You're just going to have to do without," when it comes to a simple amendment like this to save \$147 million a year to bribe Brazil cotton producers and an unwillingness to go into the title I subsidy programs for cost savings, then what the heck are we doing around here?

□ 2140

It is just beyond the pale that we're willing to take the deep cuts—and the chairman of the Agriculture Committee claimed a 12 percent cut in the farm bill, but he didn't say where those cuts were coming from. I'll tell you where it's not coming from. It's not coming from these subsidy programs. It's not coming from the cotton subsidy program that has gotten us into this problem. A handful of powerful cotton families are holding this institution hostage in order to maintain these subsidy programs that have benefited them for too long. Talk about benefiting the few at the expense of the many; this is the classic example of this Agriculture appropriation bill before us this evening. We can do a heck of a lot better.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I will reclaim my time to say we may have some differences over the underlying trade agreement and the mandates and the process which got us to this point, but I agree, subsidies—or bribes—on top of subsidies is insane in these tough budget times.

And I would just note that we're going to be confronted very soon with another limitation amendment on another bill where we're going to have a



choice: We're going to abandon the American trucking industry to Mexico—which is, again, exacting tribute from the U.S., \$4 billion a year worth of tariffs, to try and drive our companies south of the border to use Mexican drivers.

So time and time again these trade agreements are failing us. I think it's bigger than the problem of the subsidies in the farm bill, and this Congress needs to pay attention. One way or another, we're either going to get real about our deficits and what's really essential to the American people—feeding our people, clothing our people, and putting American people to work—or we're going to abandon ourselves to this failed notion of the WTO and other trade agreements.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the world has changed. It's not enough to simply buy American anymore, we have to sell American. We have to sell our American agriculture products, our technology products and services all throughout the world. But oftentimes, when we compete, we find much of the world is tilted against us. Other countries cut agreements to make it tough for us to sell. That's why we are involved in the World Trade Organization, to insist that other countries play by the rules, but that means America has to play by the rules as well.

We lost this case in the WTO. So the question today isn't about cotton subsidies or even saving money; it's about the smart way to address this issue that protects American jobs.

Now I am very sympathetic to this amendment. Paying Brazil nearly \$12 million a month is not the right way to resolve this issue, and I agree with that. In fact, America should simply live up to its WTO obligation and insist that others do the same as well.

The settlement that's in place today is necessary to prevent Brazil from imposing almost \$1 billion of new tariffs, new taxes on American products when we try to sell them into Brazil. And it's not just agriculture products. As you heard Chairman FRANK LUCAS talk, he made the point that not only can Brazil penalize our ag products, they can tax and tariff a broad range of products, especially America's innovation economy. So in your State, if you have companies that produce pharmaceuticals, medical devices, business software, technology, anything in the innovation sector of America, your companies and your workers face the loss of jobs and the loss of product sales because of this issue.

So the smart way to handle this is to deal with this not only in the farm bill, but at the WTO today, insisting that as we end these cotton subsidies, other countries end their agricultural subsidies as well. That is the smart way to

resolve this issue that doesn't hurt America and jobs, in fact protects our American intellectual property rights in Brazil and other countries.

This is an issue of doing it the smart way. I oppose this amendment. I urge our colleagues to continue to work together to resolve this issue in a smart way for our economy and a smart way for our jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago my friend from California had an amendment that she did withdraw that really wanted to codify into law the USDA's rules regarding the school lunch program. And while I won't go into the lengthy reasons why it's the wrong way to go for nutrition—not just the cost that it bears to the schools, but also the fact that USDA was recommending reducing the consumption of potatoes, corn, peas and lima beans to just one serving a week—which believe me I was shocked. But it wasn't just myself that had this reaction; it was also the California Fruit Growers Association, it was the National School Boards Association, it was the Council of the Great City Schools that wrote a letter. And that's why I and 40 other colleagues wrote to Mr. Vilsack of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in reaction to the promulgation of these rules.

I will enter into the RECORD the testimony I was going to give until she withdrew the amendment, as well as these four letters.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Breakfasts and lunches served in schools are important components of the diets of school age children. Improving the nutritional profile of meals served to school children is very important.

When the USDA proposed a rule that eliminated potatoes from the School Breakfast program and limited the School Lunch program to one cup a week of potatoes, I was very concerned.

On the Agriculture Committee, I have made it frequently known how important healthy living and nutritious eating habits are to me as a person, a mother, a grandmother and as a legislator. It is especially near and dear to my heart when we discuss policies that affect children's nutritional needs.

When I heard that the USDA recommended reducing the consumption of potatoes, corn, peas, and lima beans—I was shocked.

When my daughter was growing up, I took great care to ensure that she ate healthy, bal-

anced meals. Of course, potatoes were a part of that equation. You all know that they are full of potassium, vitamins C and B6, potassium, fiber, and antioxidants. I cannot understand why the USDA would want to reduce school children's consumption of potatoes.

I think that it is short sighted for the USDA to ignore the health benefits that the potato provides. When looking at how to incentivize healthier eating habits, we in Congress need to find a way to encourage and educate program recipients to eat balanced meals.

I think it is very important to make sure that children receive balanced meals, and that certainly includes potatoes.

I, along with forty-one of my colleagues sent a letter to the USDA asking a number of questions about this proposed rule. Mr. Speaker, without objections, I would like to submit a copy of this letter to the RECORD.

Mr. Chair, potatoes, lima beans, peas, and corn are all healthy vegetables that should certainly be in the School Breakfast and Lunch Programs.

Potatoes are an excellent source of potassium and good source of fiber. According to the USDA's own magazine, *Amber Waves*, potatoes deliver these nutrients at a very low cost.

FNS has estimated that the proposed rule would increase the cost of school meals by \$6.8 billion over the next five years. Per meal, the cost will increase by 14 cents per lunch and fifty cents per breakfast.

Mr. Chair, school districts and states across the country are already cash-strapped and cannot afford this increased cost.

This additional burden will be passed onto students paying full price for their meals.

While I agree with the intent of the USDA to encourage the consumption of more fruits and vegetables, whole grains, and lean proteins—restricting the consumption of nutritious vegetables like potatoes, lima beans, peas, and corn is short-sighted and not the most effective approach to achieve that goal.

I encourage my colleagues to vote no on this amendment and instruct the USDA to issue a new proposed rule on implementing the new national nutrition standards for the School Breakfast and School Lunch Programs.

CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF  
FOOD PROCESSORS,  
Sacramento, CA, June 15, 2011.

Hon. LYNN WOOLSEY,  
Rayburn House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOOLSEY: The California League of Food Processors (CLFP) respectfully opposes your amendment to the FY 2012 Agriculture Appropriations bill, H.R. 2112, prevent the Agriculture Department from reissuing more reasonable and cost effective proposed regulations on the school breakfast and lunch program.

CLFP has concerns about USDA recommending school breakfast programs eliminate "starchy vegetables" and proposing restrictions on the use of tomato paste and cheese. As I'm sure you remember CLFP members account for 95% of the fruits and vegetables canned, frozen and dehydrated/dried in California and this represents more than 35% of U.S. production. For a number of preserved food products, California produces 100% of U.S. output, for example tomato paste. These new USDA restrictions could potentially mean the loss of millions of dollars in sales of vegetables, fruit and cheese to the national school program. Its negative effects would ripple throughout the industry,



from farmers, dairymen, package manufacturers, etc. The cost impact of this rule on our schools and food producers should be considered by USDA. Affirmative changes to the meal plan relative to starchy vegetables limits and tomato serving calculations would go a long way to fixing the cost issues that are concerning to schools.

CLFP supports your efforts to help ensure school kids have access to healthy and nutritious meals. However, we urge you to allow USDA to ensure the new rule on school meals is cost neutral and resist efforts by USDA to proclaim vegetables and other healthy foods "good" or "bad".

Very Truly Yours,

ED YATES,  
President and CEO,

NATIONAL SCHOOL  
BOARDS ASSOCIATION,  
Alexandria, VA, June 14, 2011.

Re: H.R. 2112—FY 2012 Agriculture Appropriations Bill.

MEMBER,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National School Boards Association (NSBA), representing over 90,000 local school board members across the Nation, is deeply committed to fostering a healthy and positive learning environment for children to achieve their full potential. However, NSBA is gravely concerned about the financial impact of the recent child nutrition reauthorization (P.L. 111-296) on school districts at a time when many are in dire economic straits. Therefore, NSBA supports report language accompanying the FY 2012 Agriculture Appropriations bill that directs the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to propose new rules that do not create unfunded mandates for school districts.

For example, the USDA estimates a cost increase of 14 cents per school lunch under new proposed standards for school meal programs, even though the available reimbursement increase is just 6 cents. A district serving free and reduced price lunches to 5,000 students faces a potential shortfall of \$72,000 annually under this scenario. The Department recommends a number of cost-shifting measures to address the shortfall (such as increased student payments, increased state and local funding, and operational changes), that are unrealistic and unconscionable given the current economic realities for many states and communities.

School districts have already closed buildings, terminated programs and laid off teachers due to eroding local, state, and federal resources. Every dollar in unfunded mandates in the child nutrition reauthorization must come from somewhere else in the educational system and result in more layoffs, larger class sizes, narrowing of the curriculum, elimination of after-school programs, and cuts to other program areas, including school food services.

The new meal standards are just one of many provisions of P.L. 111-296 being implemented over the next two-to-three years and will impose additional costs on school districts. The reauthorization is a hollow promise to our children when it comes at the expense of the education that will help them to succeed.

Therefore, NSBA supports report language accompanying the FY 2012 Agriculture Appropriations bill that directs USDA to propose new rules that do not create unfunded mandates for school districts. Questions regarding our concerns may be directed to Lucy Gettman, director of federal programs at 703-838-6763; or by e-mail at lgettman@nsba.org.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL A. RESNICK,  
Associate Director.

COUNCIL OF THE  
GREAT CITY SCHOOLS,  
Washington, DC, June 14, 2011.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Council of the Great City Schools, the coalition of the nation's largest central city school districts, writes to call your attention to the proposed federal School Meals regulations that will cost an additional \$6.8 billion, and the possible amendment to the FY 2012 Agriculture Appropriations bill, H.R. 2112, by Representative Woolsey that would prevent the Agriculture Department from reissuing more reasonable and cost effective proposed regulations pursuant to the Committee report. The Great City Schools strongly opposes the Woolsey amendment.

Many of the nation's largest urban school districts have been among the leaders in improving the nutritional content of school meals and snacks provided to our students. Yet, our school districts are extremely concerned that USDA is proposing new federal school meals requirements costing an additional \$6.8 billion, with over \$5 billion in unreimbursed costs shifting on to school district budgets. The newly proposed school breakfast program requirements alone would cost \$4 billion, with the federal government providing not one-cent of additional federal reimbursement for these additional meal costs. The Council is skeptical that our formal regulatory comments recommending over \$4.5 billion in cost-saving changes to the rule will be accepted by USDA.

Before the Education and Workforce Committee, the San Diego Unified School District explained that they were already meeting all of the proposed new school meal nutritional standards, with the exception of the future sodium requirement, but that the school district would have to scrap its Nutrient-based School Meals program (as would 30% of the nation's school districts) and institute the new meal system required under the proposed USDA regulations, at the additional cost of over \$4 million annually to the district. School nutritionists and food service directors point out in regulatory comments that many of the newly proposed school meals requirements are unnecessary, excessive, costly, or counterproductive in the case of the regulatory prohibition on well-tested nutrient-based school meal systems.

Congress unfortunately shortcut the legislative process in passing the Senate's version of the Child Nutrition reauthorization bill in the lame duck session of the 111th Congress. The House child nutrition bill was not considered by the full House, and in fact there was no floor debate on the Senate child nutrition bill, which was adopted by unanimous consent prior to the August 2010 congressional recess. Without a full legislative process, the extent of the unreimbursed costs reflected in the USDA regulations, already under development for multiple years, was not fully examined. The drumbeat of celebrities and food advocacy groups promoting healthier lifestyles, and anti-obesity programs drowned out the practical considerations of cost-effectiveness and local budgetary realities faced by each of your school districts in this economic downturn.

A NO vote on the Woolsey amendment provides an opportunity to underscore the Appropriations Committee report that the Agriculture Department should withdraw its overreaching new federal school meals rules, and reissue a more realistic and workable proposed regulation.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL CASSERLY,  
Executive Director.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, May 5, 2011.

Hon. TOM VILSACK,  
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
Whitten Building, Independence Avenue,  
SW, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY VILSACK: Breakfasts and lunches served in the school setting are important components of the diets of school age children. Improving the nutritional profile of meals served in schools and maintaining participation rates are important priorities. We share your commitment to continually improving the contribution of the school meal to the nutritional needs of school children and to encourage healthy lifestyles for children that are built on a foundation of sound nutrition and physical activity.

USDA recently published a proposed rule on school meal plans to reflect the Dietary Guidelines. That proposal was based in great part on a study by the Institute of Medicine (IOM) commissioned by USDA. The recently released 2010 Dietary Guidelines identified potassium, fiber, vitamin D and calcium as nutrients of concern for all Americans, including school age children. Changes to the school meal plans should take steps toward increasing the consumption of these key nutrients by increasing student access to fruits and vegetables that are either "excellent" or "good" sources.

Changes to the school meal plans must consider the constraints faced by school lunch providers. School lunch providers need to offer nutritious affordable options that children will eat and that will encourage continued high rates of participation in both breakfast and lunch programs. For many children, the school meals are their prime source of nutrition for the day. Changes that discourage participation will reduce the overall health and wellness of American children.

As we continue to follow the development of the next generation of school meal plans, we would appreciate your thoughts on the following questions:

In the proposed rule, USDA indicates that implementation of the proposal will result in \$6.8 billion in increased costs over five years and that small entities will incur 80 per cent of that increase. Do you have estimates on the impact of these cost increases on participation among reimbursed, partially reimbursed and paying participants?

Potatoes are rates as an "excellent" source of potassium and a "good" source of fiber. According to a recent article in the March 2011, USDA magazine, Amber Waves, potatoes deliver these nutrients at a very low cost. What is the rationale for eliminating potatoes from the breakfast meal and limiting them to one cup a week when they provide cost effective access to two key nutrients of concern identified by the IOM?

By limiting access to potatoes and other starchy vegetables, the proposed meal plans seem to advance the notion that this will increase the consumption of the orange, green and other types of vegetables otherwise offered. Is there science to support the theory that consumption of orange, green and other types of vegetables will increase is offered more often? What science exists that measures this type of vegetable menu change on nutrient delivery?

The starchy vegetable category includes vegetables with a variety of nutritional characteristics. What are the key characteristics that USDA identified which link the vegetables placed in this category, and how are they distinct from other vegetables excluded from the starchy vegetable category?

According to the nutrition experts, bananas and potatoes are very similar in their nutritional makeup. This goes beyond both being

rich in potassium. It includes similarities in carbohydrates, dietary fiber and other nutrients. Should both bananas and potatoes have serving limits in the proposed meal plans?

The meal plan acknowledges a preference for orange and dark green vegetables? Is there sufficient science to support such a preference for orange and dark green vegetables? Would Irish potatoes with yellow, purple or other flesh color be considered starchy vegetables?

According to the proposed rule, lima beans in the fresh, canned or frozen form are considered starchy vegetables. In dried form they are legumes. Are there nutritional changes between the forms that support such a distinction?

The proposed meal plans are based on consumption data available from 2002 that was reviewed by the IOM for their report. Did USDA evaluate the applicability of that consumption data on potatoes and other starchy vegetables, given changes in preparation methods for products currently offered in school?

Are the serving limits on starchy vegetables, and potatoes in particular, based primarily on the nutritional profile of the product or on the preparation methods for the product?

Thank you in advance for your feedback to our questions. We look forward to working with you toward our common goal of improving the well-being of our nation's school children.

Sincerely,

Jean Schmidt, Joe Baca, Rick Berg, Ken Calvert, K. Michael Conaway, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Renee L. Ellmers, Wally Herger, Bill Huizenga, Raúl R. Labrador, Dan Burton, Dennis A. Cardoza, Jim Costa, Sean P. Duffy, Stephen Lee Fincher, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Steve King, Doug Lamborn, Tom Latham, Tom McClintock, Michael H. Michaud.

Devin Nunes, Collin C. Peterson, Chellie Pingree, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Michael K. Simpson, Robert E. Latta, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Candice S. Miller, William L. Owens, Thomas E. Petri, Reid J. Ribble, Kurt Schrader, Adrian Smith, Marlin A. Stutzman, Scott R. Tipton, Greg Walden, Steve Womack, Lee Terry, Fred Upton, Timothy J. Walz, Todd C. Young.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act for "Departmental Administration", "Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments", administrative expenses under the third paragraph under "Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account", administrative expenses under the fourth paragraph under "Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account", and "Foreign Agricultural Service—salaries and expenses" are hereby reduced by, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Food and Drug Administration—salaries and expenses" is hereby increased by, \$5,000,000, \$20,000,000, \$10,000,000, \$4,000,000, \$10,000,000, and \$49,000,000, respectively.

Mr. DINGELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a good amendment.

At a time when 30 people have been grossly sickened and died in Germany and 3,000 have been sickened, we are cutting Food and Drug's enforcement budget. The legislation would cut the food safety budget of FDA by \$87 million below fiscal year 11, and \$205 million below the President's fiscal year 12 request.

We are witnessing now one of the deadliest *E. coli* outbreaks ever overseas in Europe, and that infection is spreading across the society of the world. My amendment has the support of the Consumers Union, Pew Charitable Trusts, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, U.S. PIRG, and the National Women's Health Network.

It is time for us to understand that every year in the United States, 3,000 Americans are killed with bad food, 128,000 are hospitalized, 48 million are made sick. We have imported food that is causing all manner of difficulty: Bad peanuts with salmonella, bad mushrooms, *E. coli* in peppers, melamine in dairy products, salmonella in eggs, bad shellfish and fish from China.

The amendment sees to it that Food and Drug has the resources it needs to do the job to protect the American people from bad food being imported into the United States. We are able to inspect less than 1 percent of the food coming into the United States. This is a positive risk to the American consuming public.

The situation here is indefensible. The House last year passed major improvements in our food safety laws. And we saw to it—we had a funding mechanism which was removed by the Senate. But without the adequate funding that this amendment would afford to our people, we will find that they are at risk of serious health dangers from bad food and from sickness that comes with those things. We are here, by this amendment, giving Food and Drug the resources that it needs, some \$49 million, to see to it that these imported foods and other foods are safe.

□ 2150

This is extremely important. And while you might say, well, I don't know whether it is going to affect me, somebody in this country is going to get sick because bad food came in and because it kills people when that happens.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment until we can get ourselves in a situation where we have proper and adequate funding for Food and Drug to see to it that our people are safe from imports which are causing sickness, illness and death to the American people.

The legislation, unfortunately, does cut the food safety budget, and it cuts it in ways which are threatening a piece of legislation which has strengthened Food and Drug with the support of not just farmers and consumers, but also of the food processing industry, which rallied around and supported the legislation along with consumer groups and all of the other sources in industry, recognizing we desperately need something to be done to ensure that our people do not get sick and die from bad imported foods.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. I urge them to do so with vigor until such time as we can get a fee system in place which will adequately support Food and Drug and see to it that our people can sleep easily after they have a full meal knowing that the food they have consumed is safe.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise with great temerity in opposition to the amendment by the great gentleman from Michigan.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I would note that over the last 2 days we have heard how ag credit and rural housing have had deep cuts in this bill, and yet now we have an amendment that would cut more from them and would impart those funds on a program that between fiscal year 2004 and the current fiscal year has experienced a net budget authority increase of \$2 billion, a 121 percent increase, and over the same time period, direct appropriations increases of over \$1 billion, or 75 percent. Implementation of the Food Safety Modernization Act of 2010 would require an additional \$1.4 billion in new budget authority. If the President's budget request were adopted, the result would be a 156 percent increase for FDA since 2004.

This level of spending is unsustainable. While the recommended funding level for FDA in this bill is an 11.5 percent decrease below the amount provided in the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution, the subcommittee's overall allocation was reduced by 13.4 percent. Hence, this program suffered a smaller reduction than other programs within the budget.

Once again, with these massive increases in budget authority and in actual spending through direct appropriations over the time period 2004 and the current fiscal year, Mr. Chairman, and given the fact that ag credit and rural housing have already taken the types of deep cuts that are referenced in the rest of the bill, I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. I rise in support of the Dingell amendment to partially restore the Food and Drug Administration funding to the fiscal year 2012 agriculture appropriations bill.

I listened to what my colleagues said on the other side of the aisle. The fact of the matter is that today's bill slashes the FDA by \$572 million, or 21 percent, below the President's request, and by \$285 million, or 12 percent, below this year.

I beg to differ with the gentlewoman. This is not the time to be cutting the FDA's budget. We have had many scares. We have had many outbreaks. We have had people die. We have had people become seriously ill. That is why in the last Congress we passed the landmark Food Safety Act, because we wanted to have increased inspection of food manufacturing plants, increased scrutiny of imported foods, and development of the capability to more quickly respond to food-borne illnesses and minimize their impact.

I don't know about you, but when I go home, I hear a great deal of concern about the quality and the safety of our food supply and our groceries. When people buy food in the supermarket, when they go and buy it at a roadside stand, they are very concerned about the quality of the food and whether they are going to get sick. That is why we passed the landmark Food Safety Act. It is clear that we have just recently had the E. Coli breakout. The Nation's food supply is so extremely vulnerable, and the FDA must be equipped to keep it safe.

The FDA has important responsibilities to protect and promote the health of the American people. To succeed in that mission, FDA must ensure the safety of not just food, but drugs and medical devices that Americans rely on every day. They don't just need to oversee the safety of the products. They also need to be involved in facilitating scientific innovation that makes these products safe, effective, and more affordable.

Now, these efforts are especially critical today because I believe that American competitiveness depends on our ability to innovate. To do that, we must properly fund key agencies like the FDA that are essential to assisting in the development of new drugs and devices. FDA places a high importance on promoting innovation. In fact, they are currently developing a new Innovation Pathway, an initiative to help promising technologies get to market. But let me share something with my colleagues. One of the FDA's senior leadership staff testified before the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee recently and assured us that these cuts would prevent such efforts from moving forward.

What I am trying to emphasize is that whether you look at it from the point of view of the food supply, whether you look at it from the point of view of innovation, to make cuts in the FDA budget simply makes no sense.

It is crucial to job creation. It is crucial to people feeling safe about what they eat, and the government has to be responsible for facilitating an environment where Americans can continue to innovate. It is a key to creating new thriving industries that will produce millions of good jobs here at home and a better future for the next generation. If government abandons its role, we run the real risk of squandering too many opportunities that lead to innovative discoveries and great economic benefits.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is the funding level put forth in today's appropriations bill is inadequate. FDA is already an underfunded agency. If we don't continue to give the FDA the resources it needs to complete its mission, they cannot support initiatives that save lives and create jobs; and these are priorities that Congress should embrace.

I listened to what my colleagues say on the other side of the aisle. I understand we have to be concerned about funding and budgets and that we have a deficit. We also have to figure out what is important as a priority. The American people have told us that food safety is a priority. That is why we passed this landmark bill last year.

There has to be a significant increase in funds, even in this environment, if we are going to keep the food supply safe. If we don't do that, a lot of economic activity is also going to suffer, including innovation, including what we can do for the future to keep this country competitive. So I understand what she is saying, but I also think that it is very important to restore these funds.

I want to commend my colleague, Mr. DINGELL, for putting forth this amendment, and I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I stand in opposition to the amendment, but with great admiration for the author of the amendment—but still disagreement.

Now, the previous speaker actually said that FDA funding has been slashed. FDA is funded both with direct appropriations and with fees. Last year, their funding level was \$3.6 billion. This year, it is \$3.64 billion. It is a little bit more. I would say it is level funding. But FDA funding has not been slashed, and it is very important for us to realize that.

Number two, let me show you something about the FDA funding history, Mr. Chairman. If you can see this, this chart actually goes back to 2000 and goes up to 2011. It has been nothing but a 10-year climb uphill for the FDA. And while a lot of people are saying the FDA funding is slashed, there is not even a slight dip in any of this 10-year

funding chart. It is very important for us to realize that.

□ 2200

Now, the second point is, in the FDA hearing, I was concerned about FDA's ability to do food safety and to take on this big mission. Here is why:

You hear the figure of about 48 million foodborne illnesses—a very high number which we are enormously concerned about—but 20 percent of those illnesses are from known, or specified, pathogens. Nearly 60 percent of the illnesses from known pathogens comes from the Norovirus. So how do we address this?

The CDC tells us on their March 4 memo that appropriate hand hygiene is likely the most important method to prevent the Norovirus infection and to control transmission. Reducing any Norovirus present on hands is best accomplished by thorough handwashing. Now, in the FDA's 630-page budget request, there is not one mention of Norovirus. I believe that that's relevant.

The second point: The second highest cause of illness is salmonella; but under its authority, the existing authority, before the Food Safety Modernization Act was passed by the House, the FDA updated its own food safety as respect to salmonella. They are saying—and this was according to their own press release in July of last year—that as many as 79,000 illnesses and 30 deaths due to the consumption of eggs contaminated with salmonella may be avoided. That was last year. That was before a new bureaucracy. This bureaucracy, by the way, over a 10-year period of time, will cost \$1.4 billion and will hire 17,000 new Federal employees.

The third highest cause of foodborne illnesses is clostridium. Again, in the FDA's 630-page budget request, it was only mentioned once.

I want to say something else that is very important. Do we believe that McDonald's and Kentucky Fried Chicken and Safeway and Kraft Foods—and any brand name that you can think of—are not concerned about food safety? The food supply in America is very safe as the private sector self-polices because they have the highest motivation. They don't want to be sued. They don't want to go broke. They want their customers to be healthy and happy and to come back and give them repeat business.

Now, in response to the 2006 E. coli outbreak that happened in California with spinach, where three people died and 200 consumers were sickened, the California Leafy Green Products Handler Marketing Agreement was made. This is a private sector agreement which has done already 2,000 farm audits on a voluntary basis. Nearly 200 billion servings of lettuce and spinach and other leafy greens produced under this program have been surveyed. It is a successful private sector initiative, and those types of things happen all

the time in the private sector, but we're blind to it.

Here are some numbers from the CDC. It's very important because I think America loves to beat itself up over things all the time. The CDC numbers, Mr. Chairman: There are 48 million foodborne illnesses reported a year, 128,000 hospitalizations, 3,000 deaths. Those numbers are very high. I'm very concerned about it. That's why we spend a lot of money already on food safety.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to continue with this, Mr. Chairman.

You have 311 million Americans eating three meals a day. That's 933 million meals eaten each day. That's nearly 1 billion food consumption events in our country, which is over 360 billion meals consumed. If you do the math in going back to the 48 million foodborne illnesses, according to the USDA, our food safety rate is 99.99 percent.

I want to address the 48 million, but what I also suggest to you is that we can spend \$45 million more for FDA funding; we can spend \$100 million more or we can spend \$1 billion more, but I don't think you can increase this number of a 99.99 percent food safety rate according to the CDC. So, in these times of very tight budgets, it is very important to keep these facts in mind.

I am going to close with this statement by the Democrat Secretary of Agriculture, Tom Vilsack, and this was as of yesterday. He said he is "reasonably confident" that U.S. consumers won't be faced with the same sort of E. coli outbreak now plaguing Germany. He goes on and explains why—because of the current food safety laws in place and the current food safety funding.

Mr. CONAWAY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DOLD). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I yield to the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my good friend for yielding to me.

I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the Appropriations Committee and their extraordinary staffs for their courtesy to me as we have gone on through this legislation and through the discussion of this amendment.

I've listened to my Republican colleagues tell us how great we're doing. My good friend, for whom I have enormous fondness, presents us with a bunch of pictures of food. It looks

great. Maybe it's safe and maybe it's not. He has got a bunch of numbers that say that it's 99.99 percent safe. That sounds wonderful.

But what are the real facts? All right.

The real facts are that, at the time that this cut is going into place on Food and Drug's budget, 3,300 people have been sickened in Germany with a particularly dangerous form of E. coli, and 30 people are dead. It is spreading across the German borders into other countries.

Now, how are we doing over here?

First of all, Food and Drug has been starved of resources for years and has not been able to provide the necessary protection to the American people from imported food, which is coming in and is, frankly, sickening people.

What is the situation? Salmonella and peanuts, bad mushrooms from China, E. coli in peppers coming in from Mexico, melamine in dairy products. It kills kids. It kills babies. It causes all manner of health risks and dangers.

There are bad pharmaceuticals coming in. We haven't been able to get ahold of that problem yet, but I'm going to try and get a bill that will address that; and I'm going to try and see to it that we get a fee system that will enable us to not have to quarrel about these moneys on the House floor.

But in this country, let's look. If this is going so well and if the Secretary of Agriculture is so right and if my dear friend from Georgia is correct, then there is really nothing to worry about; and I would like somebody around here to tell me what I'm then going to tell the 3,000 people who are killed in this country by bad food every single year. 128,000 of them are sick enough that they have to go to hospitals. On top of that, 48 million people get sick.

There is no way on God's green Earth, with the budget that Food and Drug has, that they can properly and adequately protect American food and protect the American people from the dangers of bad imported food. China is the Wild West. The stuff that they're exporting to the United States, quite frankly, I'm not sure I'd feed my hogs.

Having said these things, it is time for us to stand up to the problem and to say, Okay. We're going to spend the money that's necessary to keep people safe. We are talking about \$49 million here. A lot of money. But how much do you think it takes to bury 3,000 Americans? How much does it cost to take care of 128,000 people who are hospitalized every year because of this? or to take care of the 48 million people who get sick? and the mothers who lose babies because of bad milk and things of that kind that come in from China, where they put melamine in them to up the fictitious levels of nitrogen and protein?

So I beg you, let us do what is necessary to see to it that Food and Drug has the funds that they need to do the job to protect the American people.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk. This legislation before us would cut the food safety budget of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) by \$87 million below FY 2011 and \$205 million below the president's FY 2012 budget request. At a time when we are witnessing one of the deadliest E. coli outbreaks ever overseas in Europe, the House stands ready to cut funding for our food safety systems. This is indefensible and why I am offering an amendment that will which takes \$49 million from several administrative accounts at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and transfers them to FDA for the implementation of the Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA), of which I am the author. Specifically, this amendment cuts \$5 million from the Departmental Administration account, \$20 million from the Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments account, \$10 million from administrative expenses under the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, \$4 million from administrative expenses under the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, and \$10 million from the Foreign Agricultural Service.

I want to make clear that the offsets I am offering are difficult, and not accounts which I would cut in normal circumstances. However, these are not normal circumstances, and the draconian cuts already made by this legislation to the food safety budget leave me with no other choice. The cuts to the USDA General Administration Account and to the Buildings and Administration Account are certainly damaging. I believe in the good work USDA is doing to promote agriculture in this nation, but these specific accounts did not receive as large a cut as others. The safety of our nation's food supply must take priority over these administrative accounts.

Furthermore, the cut to the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, which provides loans to farmers when they can not obtain them in the private sector, will be taken from an administrative account which will not affect the loan levels to farmers in need. The cut to the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, which guarantees some rural housing loans, will also be taken from an administrative account which will not impact the loan level. Finally, while I am supportive of the Foreign Agricultural Service and their work to promote agricultural exports overseas and their international development efforts, I believe the American people would agree that at a time when we recently had a recent scare with Salmonella in eggs and authorities have agreed that the E. coli outbreak which is impacting Europe could happen here, our priority must be on the safety of our own food supply.

I want to make it very clear that the money given to FDA by my amendment is intended for their food safety activities. Last Congress when this institution overwhelmingly passed the Food Safety Enhancement Act, it had bipartisan support, the support of consumer groups, food safety groups and industry, and a guaranteed source of funding for food safety activities. The food safety reform law gives FDA the tools it needs to prevent and detect food-borne illnesses—like the E. coli outbreak in Germany—from occurring.

Under this new law, the FDA has the authority to recall food products, to require food facilities to have safety plans to identify and mitigate risks, and to increase the frequency of FDA inspections of facilities here and

abroad. Unfortunately, a dedicated fee to fund the changes to our food system was dropped by my friends in the Senate and now we are witnessing a perfect storm—because of the political whims of my colleagues we are limiting the funding available for food safety activities at the same time the FDA has the responsibility to begin implementation of the historic food safety law.

Year after year we witness devastating outbreaks that sicken or kill innocent people. We have seen E. coli in peppers, Salmonella in peanuts, melamine in milk—the list goes on. A fee system is not a radical concept. The drug industry pays a user fee dedicated to assisting the FDA with the review of new drug applications and the medical device industry pays a user fee dedicated to the review of marketing applications. Such a fee guarantees that the FDA has a source of funding dedicated to their review process free from political posturing.

We can all agree that we must reduce our budget deficit and that all options to cut spending must be on the table. However, at a time when we are witnessing the latest E. coli outbreak in Europe sicken nearly 3,200 people and kill 33, it is unconscionable that we would cut funding from the agency whose responsibility it is to prevent such food-borne illnesses here in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment restoring funding to the FDA for their food safety activities.

Mr. FARR. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

□ 2210

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who provide non-recourse marketing assistance loans for mohair under section 1201 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. (7 U.S.C. 8731).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment to limit the subsidies for mohair.

Mohair is something that back in World War II we needed for our military uniforms. The problem is we haven't used mohair in our military uniforms since the Korean war, and yet the subsidies still continue. So this is a commonsense amendment to simply

limit this. This is roughly \$1 million a year. This is something that Congresses previously had eliminated. It crept back in.

And this limitation amendment that I would offer, I would urge my colleagues to vote for. My understanding is there's no opposition on either side of the aisle.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel in the Department of Agriculture to make) payments for the storage of cotton under section 1204(g) of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8734(g)) or for the storage of peanuts under section 1307(a) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8757(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I would hope this body would take this amendment with the same pace we did the mohair subsidies, but perhaps not.

This amendment seeks to eliminate the cotton and peanut storage payments that we have been making. I would point out to my colleagues that President Obama recommended terminating this program in his fiscal 2012 budget. No other agriculture commodities receive this type of assistance.

I would like to read a paragraph that's found on the WhiteHouse.gov Web site:

The credits allow producers to store their cotton and peanuts at the government's cost until prices rise. Therefore, storage credits have a negative impact on the amount of commodities on the market. Because storage is covered by the government, producers may store their commodities for longer than necessary. There is no reason the government should be paying for the storage of cotton or peanuts, particularly since it does not provide this assistance for any other commodities.

I happen to concur with the President on this. I hope my colleagues would find this to be a commonsense amendment to say we should not be specifying winners and losers. In this particular case, we're going to offer a storage credit for just cotton and just peanuts. It's something that I think should be eliminated. I would hope the body would concur. I would hope we would understand we're going to have to make some changes in the way we do things. This is one instance where I actually agree with the President. I'm proud to stand in support of that and

would encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BARROW. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARROW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment to eliminate storage and handling payments for cotton and peanuts.

I represent a lot of producers of these commodities, and I guess it makes me a little bit more sensitive to why storage and handling is an important part of our agricultural policy and why this amendment could have potentially devastating impacts if allowed to become law.

I believe it's in the best interest of our country to support domestic agriculture. If you think our reliance on foreign oil is a nightmare, imagine what it would be like if we had to rely that much on foreign sources of food and fiber. For that reason, it has been the policy of the Congress for decades to provide a safety net to help protect domestic farmers where prices are low and world markets are unfavorable.

If you represent farm country or if you've ever worked on a farm bill, you have some idea of what a delicate balance it can be to use the different tools at our disposal to craft a law that meets the needs of farmers and consumers. Different commodities have different economies. Prices sometimes swing wildly. Sometimes, even biological differences need to be accounted for.

For example, if peanuts are not stored correctly, they can develop toxicity that renders them not only useless, but dangerous, to the consumer. Storage and handling assistance has been developed as an efficient policy for peanuts because it not only gives the farmer some latitude about how long he can store his crops, but it also improves food safety for the public.

Mr. Chairman, I was on the Ag Committee back in 2008 when we crafted the last farm bill. It's been the law of the land since then and will continue to be until next year. It's the basis on which every farmer has planned during that time. This amendment creates uncertainty for those farmers. It threatens their jobs, and it threatens the domestic production the rest of us depend on.

I believe this amendment is bad policy, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. I also oppose the amendment.

This amendment does not save one nickel in fiscal 2012. It's a bit theater. And unlike mohair, peanuts and cotton

have a little different circumstances. The storage that is talked about here is only paid if the prices for these two commodities drops below their loan rate. CBO does not estimate this to happen for the next decade in terms of these prices. The loan rates are substantially below where the current prices are. That means the producers pay for these storage costs as these products are moved to market.

So this amendment, while we debate it for some 15 to 20 minutes, will cost more to debate than it will save for the taxpayers. It is an integral part of the safety net that these producers rely upon.

You've heard this over and over tonight: The Ag Committee is best suited to develop a proper safety net and an ag policy for this country. This country has had an ag policy from its inception. We ought to stand by that ag policy once it's put in place. We put it in place in 2008. Many tradeoffs were made between conservation programs, commodity programs. Cotton and peanuts were in the mix.

We will have those exact same conversations this time next year. The farm bill will come to the floor, and those who disagree with the farm policy that's developed in the Ag Committee will have ample opportunity to come to this floor and make these arguments once again. But to do this in an appropriations bill in basically a drive-by shooting manner, in my view, is wrongheaded. We ought to trust that the Ag Committee will get this work done and get it done properly.

The 2008 farm bill was put in place. Ag producers across this country, bankers across this country, implement dealers across this country have looked at that as a deal. Most folks in the business world don't back up on a deal when they don't have to. And we don't have to in this particular instance because, as I said at the start of this, it does not cost the taxpayer any money as long as prices are high. CBO and most folks estimate that in the near term the prices will not drop below 18 cents a pound for peanuts or 52 cents a pound for cotton.

So I respectfully disagree with my colleague's attempt to alter the farm bill in this way, in an appropriations bill, and I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I think this amendment is very, very ill advised.

Storage and handling fees are an integral part of the peanut program and the cotton program. Removal of these fees will strike against the growers, the farmers' bottom line. The current marketing loan rate is \$355 per ton. There has been no increase in the peanut loan rate, which is the safety net, since the 2002 farm bill. With the new farm bill expected to take place next

year, it's unfair for the program to change dramatically in this final year of the 2008 farm bill.

Peanut growers changed their program from a supply-management program, in 2002, to a marketing loan program. We eliminated the old quota system. This included a price reduction from \$610 per ton to \$355 per ton marketing loan. The growers will lose even more if the program suffers another \$50 per ton reduction due to the elimination of the storage and handling fees.

Peanuts are a semiperishable commodity. This is different from corn, from wheat and other commodities. It is economically unfeasible for producers to store their peanuts on the farm like other commodities such as corn and wheat. Peanuts need a secure and an atmospheric-controlled environment. Peanuts require intense and constant management in the warehouse storage, which a farmer does not have the skills to do.

□ 2220

Without proper management, a farmer's peanuts could go from what is known as a Seg 1 loan price, which is the best, to a Seg 3 loan price, which is contamination due to aflatoxin.

Elimination of the storage and handling program could certainly impact food safety, the safety of the product.

Shellers basically control over 75 percent of the peanuts after the peanuts leave the farmer's control. Since peanuts are semi-perishable and due to the highly concentrated shelling industry, farmers are at the mercy of the shellers in terms of pricing. Shellers could possibly force the farmer to accept a lower price that would cover the storage and handling cost. Farmers then have no alternative in selling their peanuts. That eliminates the competitive edge.

This could effectively lower the loan rate to producers, as I said, by \$50 a ton. The storage and handling program has effectively been a no-net-cost program to the government. Thus, the elimination of it will not help to reduce the Federal deficit.

Again, we are here about to pull the rug out from under farmers who have relied upon what this Congress and what this government has done in setting farm policy starting from 2008 to 2012. Why would we come at this point and pull the rug out from under them and upset all of their plans? Many times they have made loans, they've had to purchase equipment, and particularly throughout the Southeast, the equipment that is required for southeastern peanut growers and southeastern farmers is varied. We've got a broad portfolio, unlike the Midwest. We grow multiple crops.

In the Southeast, from Virginia all the way to Texas, you will find that farmers will grow corn; they will grow grain, of course; they'll grow peanuts; they'll grow soybeans; and they'll grow cotton. Each of those commodities at least will require three different kinds

of equipment, and the combines and the equipment for cotton costs anywhere from \$250,000 to \$350,000. Other equipment for peanuts, for grain, \$150,000, \$500,000.

This is going to undermine the bottom line, it's going to remove the competitive edge that American peanut growers have, and it's going to devastate our ability to maintain the highest quality, the safest, and the most economical peanuts anywhere in the world.

I think this is very, very ill-advised. I think it will undermine American agriculture. It will lessen our food security, and certainly that is the last thing that we need to do because we are already energy insecure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 80, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments" by \$13,000,000, and increasing the amount made available for the "Office of the Secretary," by \$5,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the Chairman, and I thank the Agriculture appropriations subcommittee for their kindness and their deliberateness in this very long evening and as well the ranking member along with the chairman.

This is a simple amendment about food and about helping more Americans get healthy food. There is not one of us that does not understand how dry and difficult a desert is. This amendment is simply about food deserts in rural and urban areas.

This amendment provides a \$5 million increase to the Office of the Secretary to allow assistance to provide relief to those who are suffering from the lack of access to food quality.

This is a healthy child, we would hope. That healthy child needs to have good food. These funds will increase the availability of affordable healthy food in underserved urban and rural communities, particularly through the development or equipping of grocery stores and other healthy food retailers.

Fast-food restaurants and convenience stores line the blocks of low-income neighborhoods, offering few if any healthy options. In rural areas, there may be no access at all. This particularly impacts African American and Hispanic communities and, as I indicated, rural communities.

This climate in the difficult times that we have requires us to be able to



allow families to have access to good food. We also have the issues of obesity and as well nutrition. Food deserts impact many districts, and I will say to you that Texas in particular has fewer grocery stores per capita than any other State.

According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, 32 percent of all children in Texas face a nutrition issue. Targeting assistance to food desert areas will provide healthy food to affected areas, open new markets for farmers, create jobs, and bolster development in distressed communities.

Farmers markets are a good idea, but farmers markets sometimes are difficult to find in our communities. Again, let me emphasize, this is about rural and urban areas. This initiative will provide for the availability of healthy food alternatives to some 23 million people living in food deserts.

Let me just suggest to you that these families that we care for, families, young families of the military, many of you have heard stories where the military families are on food stamps. Many of them live in areas beyond their bases, and some of their families are back home in rural and urban areas. This amendment, which will provide an \$8 million gift back to the government, will give a mere \$5 million to provide the opportunity for those food desert loopholes, if you will—rural places in our Nation where there are big gaps with access to food, and as well urban areas—to have access to the opportunity for good and healthy food.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time and ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment that addresses the question of helping those who need healthy food.

I thank the Chairman for this opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 2112, which will reach back into the bill to increase the funding for the Office of the Secretary by \$5 million dollars. This increase, provided for by reducing the funding for operations and maintenance of Buildings and Facilities in order to fund President Obama's Healthy Food Funding Initiative, HFFI. Supporting this amendment will not only fund an important pilot program, but save the government \$8 million.

Funding HFFI will increase the availability of affordable, healthy foods in underserved urban and rural communities, particularly through the development or equipping of grocery stores and other healthy food retailers.

These "food deserts", communities in which residents do not have access to affordable and healthy food options, disproportionately affect African American and Hispanic communities. Fast food restaurants and convenience stores line the blocks of low income neighborhoods, offering few, if any healthy options.

Many of my colleagues across the aisle have made arguments about the economic climate, and the need for budgetary cuts, and I agree that we must work to reduce the deficit. We cannot, however, continue to make irresponsible cuts to programs for the underserved, lower income families, and minorities.

Since the mid-1970s, the prevalence of overweight and obesity has increased sharply for both adults and children, and obesity is a

grave health concern for all Americans. However, food deserts have taken a toll on low income and minority communities and exacerbated growing obesity rates and health problems.

According to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, 80 percent of black women and 67 percent of black men are overweight or obese. African American children from low income families have a much higher risk for obesity than those in higher income families.

The CDC also estimates African American and Mexican American adolescents ages 12–19 are more likely to be overweight, at 21 percent and 23 percent respectively, than non-Hispanic white adolescents who are 14 percent overweight. In children 6–11 years old, 22 percent of Mexican American children are overweight, compared to 20 percent of African American children and 14 percent of non-Hispanic white children.

Food deserts have greatly impacted my constituents in the 18th Congressional District, and citizens throughout the state of Texas. Texas has fewer grocery stores per capita than any other state. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, identified 92 food desert census tracts in Harris County alone. These areas are subdivisions of the county with between 1,000 to 8,000 low income residents, with 33 percent of people living more than a mile from a grocery store.

According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, 32 percent of all children in Texas are overweight or obese. These statistics underscore the staggering affect food deserts have on the health of low income and minority communities. In Houston and other cities across the country, local programs have proved that well targeted funding and assistance can create viable business outcomes and increase access to healthy food.

Targeting federal financial assistance to food desert areas through the Healthy Food Funding Initiative will provide more healthy food to affected neighborhoods, open new markets for farmers, create jobs, and bolster development in distressed communities.

The Healthy Food Funding Initiative is not a handout, or a crutch. Funding through this program is intended to provide financial and technical assistance in support of market planning, promotion efforts, infrastructure and operational improvements, and increase availability of locally and regionally produced foods.

This initiative will increase the availability of healthy food alternatives to the 23.5 million people living in food deserts nationwide. Yes, we must work toward reducing the deficit, but cutting programs that provide healthy food to those who simply do not have access to nutritional options, is not the way.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. My dear friend from Texas has worked diligently to find something to work out with this. As I had indicated to her last night, we're trying to work on some alternatives and see if there's a way to do it. Just in the last 30 minutes, I've gotten something from GAO that says that you could actually cut out \$45 million dollars from this program and that it would not affect the potential of it.

Right now what I will do—and I know my friend from California is rising. Let me yield to him because I know he probably has a different view, but I want to kind of keep the debate going.

Mr. FARR. Go ahead. I'll just strike the last word.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, you've got 4 minutes from me. You could still strike the last word. That gives you 9 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

I have concerns about where the money comes from as all these bills are offsetting, but I think that the purpose here should be funded. We have this whole initiative—and some of it has been attacked tonight—about trying to get healthy foods grown by American farmers to people in areas that are called food deserts, as the gentle lady from Texas pointed out. There are places that people just can't go. There isn't a grocery store. There aren't fresh fruits and vegetables.

□ 2230

I mean, think of the 7-Eleven. That's the kind of convenience stores that are around. Even the one we use up here a couple of blocks away is very limited in the amount of fresh fruits and vegetables it has.

So what this initiative is all about, and it's the President's initiative too, is trying to get food—it's an educational process. I think the hardest cultural—this is what I learned from living in other cultures in the Peace Corps. The hardest thing to do is to get people to change their eating habits. We all know that struggle when we go on a diet. So it takes a lot of education. It takes a lot of support, but it also takes the need to have access to it.

You need to have access to the fresh fruits and vegetables, and they can either come to you in a farmers market or you can go to them. But if you have neither a farmers market and there's nothing to go to, you have no option. And that's what this amendment is about, getting some money into the program that will be able to outreach and getting good, nutritious food to families who most need it who, without that, have a good chance of not growing up healthy, high incidence of obesity, high incidence of diabetes, high-risk issues that cost a lot of money for the taxpayers when they have to go on dialysis or have to be under treatment.

So we have spent many years here in the committee—and the chairman knows it very well—of looking at how do we prevent this from happening when the choices are there. These are preventable diseases and preventable ill health situations, but we've got to reach out and do it, and that's what this amendment does and I think it deserves support.

Mr. KINGSTON. If I could reclaim my time, I want to read this quote from GAO. It says: The committee may wish to consider reducing the request for this initiative for FY 12 by \$45 million until the effectiveness of these



demonstration projects has been established.

And I want to say to my friend from Texas, we had some talks around this but not directly addressing it, not direct hearing; but I do remember and the gentleman from California might and I think Ms. Foley might remember that the Safeway in Washington, D.C., I believe has some sort of grant I believe to operate in an area that was considered a food desert, and I believe that that is one of the most profitable Safeways there is. Do either of you have a recollection of that? Thank you for pulling the rug out from underneath me this early.

Mr. FARR. I have a recollection of that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Do you remember that, Mr. FARR, that discussion?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Was that not about food deserts?

Mr. FARR. Yes, it was. But remember Ms. KAPTUR's amendment in our committee of trying to subsidize farmers markets to go into high-risk areas to get it started so that it does develop a market approach and can be sustainable, but we reach out and do those kinds of things.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me reclaim my time. GAO reported that a variety of approaches, including improving access to targeted foods, have the potential to increase the consumption of targeted food that could contribute to a healthy diet, but little is known about the effectiveness of these approaches.

And so I think what I would like to do, Mr. Chairman, is continue to oppose this; but knowing my good friend from Texas and from California will keep this as a priority, we'll talk about this. You know, the hour's late. The gentlewoman's been working on this for a long time, but I need a little more focus on it before I could accept it.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. First of all, let me thank Mr. FARR and Mr. KINGSTON. I had hoped my friend from Georgia could see in his heart that this is a very small microcosm for a very large issue, and that is that food deserts do exist and the families that are impacted, number of families that include those who are members of the United States military from the very youngest child.

I have been fiscally responsible, if that is the case, to narrow this very well, and I have no quarrel with individual chains engaging in marketing outreach. But I'm talking about hard-to-serve areas that include urban and rural areas where there are no food chains to engage in any benevolent assistance.

I'm also suggesting to you that if you look at the landscape of districts across the Nation, just take for example my district is number 32 in regards to food insecurity, but there are 31 above me. The people have limited access to food.

I enjoy the point that Mr. FARR made about Ms. KAPTUR's farmers markets. This will infuse energy into the farmers markets. This will create jobs for a limited amount of pilot resources. This is the right thing to do. This is to take a great land like America and say we want everybody to minimally have access to good, healthy, nutritious food.

So I would ask for the humanitarian consideration of my friends on the other side of the aisle. I thank the gentleman from California for his instructiveness and the work of the members of this Appropriations Committee, and I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, the Jackson Lee amendment. It fills the gaping hole of the lack of food by providing resources to cure the problem of food deserts.

Mr. FARR. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. GIBSON

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 80, after line 2, insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. For the cost of broadband loans, as authorized by section 601 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, to remain available until expended, there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for payments to the General Services Administration for rent under the heading "Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments" is hereby reduced by, \$6,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, over 50 congressional districts across our country have at least 10 percent of their population without access to high-speed broadband. My district is one of these over-50 districts. Now, this is a significant impediment to job creation. We have farmers without access to the high-speed broadband. We have many small businesses in our districts, including bed and breakfasts which impact our tourism without that access. This amendment helps address this situation.

Now, the underlying bill zeroes out the loan program for rural broadband.

This is down from \$22.3 million that we just closed out a few months ago for FY 11, and with a healthy respect for the leadership of the Agricultural appropriations subcommittee, I think this is a mistake.

I know that there have been issues with this program in the past. I have read the IG report. I will also say that my understanding is the administration has made progress since the publishing of that report. One of the things that has been said about this program is it has not been able to address the significant volume of requests, and I think it's important to note that in March 2011 they cleared the backlog of all the applications for the program; and, in fact, there's now up to \$100 million in new loan applications, showing the interest in this program.

Another criticism has been that this program is duplicative and that, in fact, you can apply under telemedicine for rural areas. And I will tell you that we have tried that in our district with no success, and this program that I'm offering as an amendment today for \$6 million, a loan program, fully offset, is the only program exclusively dedicated to rural broadband. And this program, this amendment, \$6 million can give us access to and support over \$100 million in loan applications.

□ 2240

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will help create jobs, and it will help our farmers with profitability. Of course, I'm biased. But I believe we've got the smartest, the hardest working farmers in the world. Their issue is profitability, and this amendment will help.

The CBO assesses this amendment as neutral, and it says that it will reduce outlays by \$2 million in 2012. Let me say that again. CBO says this amendment will reduce outlays by \$2 million in 2012.

So how do we offset this? How do we provide access for farmers and small businesses to loan programs? We cut the Federal bureaucracy—\$6 million in office rental payments.

Now, the USDA is blessed with some of the most significant office space among all the Federal bureaucracy. And in addition to what they have here in the District, in Beltsville, Maryland, there is additional office space of which they possess. So on top of all of that, there is \$151 million in this appropriations bill for the rental of office space, including right here on M Street in Washington, D.C. This is a good payoff to give access to our farmers so that they can have access to rural broadband.

So to all my colleagues, I say this is a good amendment. The only amendment that provides exclusive rural broadband access. It's supported by the American Farm Bureau. It's supported by the New York State Farm Bureau and numerous chambers of commerce in my district. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman from New York must remain on his feet.

Mr. GOSAR. I rise in support of the amendment proposed by Mr. GIBSON and Mr. OWENS because I think it is exactly what the American people want us to do here in Washington. The people expect us to be responsible with their tax money. The people have made it clear, more than clear, that the Federal Government is too big. Our job is to look for waste, inefficiencies, and bloat. The Gibson-Owens amendment has found such bloat and seeks to remedy it.

There is no doubt that the USDA does good work and that the agency should have suitable workspace to conduct its work. Indeed, as Mr. GIBSON has pointed out, the USDA has 3 million square feet of prime office space on The National Mall in a beautiful building that contributes to the architectural beauty of the Nation's Capital. To learn that the USDA also has a campus in Maryland that occupies 45 acres of land is, itself, concerning.

With all that office space currently available to the USDA in the Washington area and an additional \$151 million to rent office space elsewhere, why does the USDA want to rent more office space in D.C.? The people of this country will not begrudge an architecturally distinguished office for the Nation's Capital, but a luxurious high-rent office in addition is too much.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to say to the gentleman from Arizona, if I have time left over, I will yield you some. But you can also get your own 5 minutes if you want.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this.

I want to start out by saying that the committee has taken a really close look at this over the years. And I wish you could see, from where you are sitting, better the saturation level of broadband access in the United States of America. That's in the blue. As you can see, the entire country is mostly blue according to this.

But I would not want your eyes to just strain from there, so I will give you some numbers here:

New Jersey, 100 percent penetration; Florida, 99.9 percent penetration; New York, 99.8 percent; Georgia, 99.4 percent; Arizona, 98.2 percent.

This program is not necessary. And in a time when we're talking about saving money, we do not need to increase this account. The process is burdensome. We get lots of complaints from people who have had applications

pending for a long time and they can't get their questions answered, or they get approved but they can't get their money. Their eligibility is too broad. And in many areas, it competes with private sector broadband service.

Now, the IG report had a number of things that they found. They found that this rural broadband program granted loans of \$103 million to 64 communities near large cities, including \$45 million loans to 19 suburban subdivisions within a few miles of Houston, Texas. That's hardly the intent of the program.

The IG report also found out that they were competing with preexisting broadband access in many places and found that 159 of the 240 communities associated with the loans—that's 66 percent—already had service. I will repeat that. Sixty-six percent of the communities who got grants already had service.

Now, there was a little criticism, and the program was supposed to be reformed. But the IG took another look at it and found that, in 2009, only eight out of the 14 recommendations had had action taken on them. Thirty-four of 37 applications for providers were in areas where there were already private operators offering service, 34 out of 37.

So when our committee took a look at this, we felt like the program needed changing. It did not need new money. So I must respectfully disagree with my good friends who are offering this and stand in opposition of the amendment.

With that, I yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Well, I would like to disagree. And that is, as I serve a vast part of Arizona, 60 percent of Arizona, in which I serve a large number of Native American tribes which are fighting to try to get economic development and trying to get broadband service, this is exactly the kind of funding that we want to direct you to the appropriate place.

The Native Americans are exactly the place that this could go. This is the economic development that they need, and they're currently in the process of trying to get that. They're trying to build that infrastructure, and this is exactly where that fund can be.

Mr. KINGSTON. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I just want to reiterate that there is significant need for expanding access to rural broadband in America. We've got over 50 districts that have at least 10 percent of their population that are not in the 21st century, that don't have access to the high-speed broadband.

I want to remind my colleagues, this loan program reduces outlays by \$2 million in 2012, according to the CBO. This program should not be zeroed out. It should not go from \$22 million to zero. We should accept this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to accept this amendment so that we can continue to make progress with rural broadband.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Respectfully, my chairman and I disagree on this issue.

I raised this in our subcommittee of Appropriations, and his superior abilities to convince the subcommittee prevailed. But I weigh in on the side of Mr. GIBSON and Mr. GOSAR, and let me tell you why.

The information that the committee chairman has is correct insofar as it gives you numbers on broadband access that will allow you a speed of receiving service that is so slow that it is basically 20th century rather than 21st century communications. For example, under the speed at which the numbers that the gentleman from Georgia has derived cover, this 99, 98 percent coverage, it would take you 9 hours to download a movie. Now, who's going to do that?

But with this digital world we're in, the kinds of data that need to be unloaded in order to be a lone eagle, to have a business, to have the type of broadband access that my colleague from Arizona would like the Native Americans in his State to have, would require a much faster broadband service. And when you look at the speed of the broadband service that is consistent with having a robust community that has real broadband service, my State is at the rock bottom. Less than half of the people in my State have the kind of robust service that is typical of urban areas or suburban areas.

□ 2250

The same could be said for my colleague from Arizona and the areas of his State where Native Americans so desperately need the opportunity to market products over the Internet. So I encourage my colleagues to support the position of my colleagues, Mr. GIBSON and Mr. GOSAR. And I rise in support of their amendment.

I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I just wanted to ask the gentlelady if she would find the present time convenient to enter into the discussion regarding GIPSA, though we are on this amendment at this point.

Mrs. LUMMIS. With the Chairman's leave, I would consent.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Would you consent to a departure as I use the remainder of my 5 minutes to discuss the issue of the stockyards and the GIPSA rule?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for the remaining time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentlewoman. And while I will not offer an amendment to strip section 721, a legislative provision that prevents the U.S. Department of Agriculture from doing its job as instructed in the farm bill, relative to fair competition in meat products so consumers get fairly priced meats, I otherwise rise in strong opposition to the language that's in the bill.

And when the authorizing committee wrote the farm bill, USDA was directed to use the existing packers and stockyards act to restore fairness to livestock and poultry contract markets. But instead of allowing the agency to do its job, Congress, in an unevenhanded way, has allowed itself to become captured by the consolidated meat industry.

And while ranchers, farmers and producers are increasingly being squeezed out of the markets, and small, local slaughterhouses continue to close, large consolidated players manipulate the rules to favor their own business operations, and meat prices rise. Congress simply can't stand by silent.

So on behalf of the millions of farmers, ranchers and producers that struggle every day to survive as they face the gargantuan task of competing against monopolistic entities, I oppose the base language in 721.

And I would like to place two statements in the RECORD, a letter from the American Farm Bureau opposing section 721 and a letter from over 140 organizations supporting the pro-competition proposals made by the Department of Agriculture.

AMERICAN FARM  
BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Washington, DC, May 31, 2011.

Hon. MARCY KAPTUR,  
House of Representatives, House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KAPTUR: On behalf of the six million families represented by the American Farm Bureau Federation, we write to support your amendment to allow the Agriculture Department (USDA) the opportunity to complete reviewing the 60,000 comments received and the proposed rule entitled "Implementation of Regulations Required Under Title XI of the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008; Conduct in Violation of the Act." It is also imperative that USDA continue its economic analysis of the rule.

Farm Bureau is in the unique position of representing every species impacted by this rule. We also have no affiliation with major packers, integrators or processors, and therefore our only interest is the impact of this rule on farmers and ranchers. Because of this unique position, there are several provisions in this rule that we strongly support, while others give us pause.

Generally speaking, Farm Bureau's philosophy supports a market environment where our farmers and ranchers can sell their product in a way that best fits with their individual operation and risk aversion level. Our policy clearly states that "We support efforts to ensure open markets to all producers." Over the years, our farmers and ranchers have recognized the need for a referee in the marketplace, and Farm Bureau policy supports the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA)

in that role. Some of our policy supporting the authority of GIPSA includes:

"We . . . oppose any attempt to lessen the ability of [GIPSA] to adequately enforce the act and its regulations."

"We support more vigorous enforcement of U.S. antitrust laws in keeping with original intent; to include . . . [the] Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921."

"The Packers and Stockyards Act should be amended to . . . strengthen the ability of GIPSA to stop predatory practices in the meat packing industry."

We support "establishing GIPSA as the overall authority and provider of oversight to ensure livestock contracts are clearly-written, confidentiality concerns are addressed, investments are protected . . ." as well as "enhanced price transparency, [and] price discovery," and ensuring that "contractors honor the terms of contracts."

These overarching policy principles guide Farm Bureau's comments on this proposed rule.

It is also worth noting that Farm Bureau has consistently requested thorough economic analysis from agencies when promulgating new rules. Without such an analysis it is difficult for America's farmers and ranchers to assess the true impact of rules and to understand all of the implications of proposed rules. This rule is no exception.

We oppose language to preclude USDA from reviewing the comments and completing their economic analysis and are strongly opposed to any action that would stop work on that rule.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,  
President.

House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC, April 21, 2011.

ATTN: Agriculture & Appropriations Legislative Aides

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As a result of rapid consolidation and vertical integration, the livestock and poultry markets of this nation have reached a point where anti-competitive practices dominate, to the detriment of producers and consumers. Numerous economic studies in recent years have demonstrated the economic harm of current market structures and practices, and have called for greater enforcement of existing federal laws in order to restore competition to livestock and poultry markets.

Until recently, Congress and the U.S. Department of Agriculture have largely ignored these trends. Fortunately, Congress included language in the 2008 Farm Bill to require the U.S. Department of Agriculture to write regulations, using its existing Packers and Stockyards Act authorities, to begin to restore fairness and competition in livestock and poultry markets.

On June 22, 2010, the Grain Inspection Packers and Stockyards Agency (GIPSA) issued proposed rules to implement the 2008 Farm Bill mandates, and to address related anticompetitive practices in the livestock and poultry industries. These reforms are long overdue and begin to respond to the criticisms by farm groups, consumer groups, the Government Accountability Office and USDA's Inspector General about USDA's past lack of enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act. The proposed GIPSA rules define and clarify terms in the Act in order to make enforcement more effective, and to provide clarity to all players in livestock and poultry markets.

The Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 makes it unlawful for packers, swine contractors, and live poultry dealers to engage in any "unfair, unjustly discriminatory, or deceptive practice or device," or to "make or give any undue or unreasonable preference or

advantage to any particular person or locality in any respect, or subject any particular person or locality to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect." The ambiguity of these terms has resulted in uncertainty in the marketplace and hindered enforcement of the Act.

Key provisions of the proposed GIPSA rules would:

Provide contract growers with common-sense protections when making expensive investments in facilities on their farms to meet the packer or poultry company requirements; provide growers, farmers, and ranchers with access to the information necessary to make wise business decisions regarding their operations; require transparency and eliminate deception in the way packers, swine contractor and poultry companies pay farmers; eliminate collusion between packers in auction markets; and provide clarity about the types of industry practices the agency will consider to be unfair, unjustly discriminatory, or when certain practices give unreasonable preference or advantage. These are all terms used in the existing statute, which have never been adequately defined.

Prohibit retaliation by packers, swine contractors or poultry companies against farmers for speaking about the problems within industry or joining with other farmers to voice their concerns and seek improvements. Currently, many farmers are often retaliated against economically for exercising these legal rights.

Allow premiums to be paid to livestock producers who produce a premium product, but requires the packer or swine contractors to keep records to detail why they provide certain pricing and contract terms to certain producers.

Reduce litigation in the industry by eliminating the ambiguity in interpretation of the terms of the Packers and Stockyards Act. Such ambiguity leads to litigation as farmers and packers seek court action to clarify the intent of the Act.

GIPSA has received approximately 60,000 comments on the proposed rule during the five-month public comment period that ended in November 22 of 2010. USDA is in the process of analyzing those comments, and providing the in-depth cost-benefit analysis necessary before issuing the final rule.

Because of the great importance of this rule to livestock and poultry producers and consumers, and the large volume of misinformation about the rule perpetuated by livestock and poultry trade associations and packer-producer groups, the undersigned organizations are writing to reiterate our strong support for the GIPSA rule and for its swift publication in final form.

We urge your support for the GIPSA rule-making process, and its efforts to restore fairness and competition in our nation's livestock and poultry markets.

Sincerely,

Agriculture and Land Based Training Association (CA); Alabama Contract Poultry Growers Association; Alliance for a Sustainable Future (PA); Alternative Energy Resources Organization (AERO)—MT; Ambler Environmental Advisory Council; American Agriculture Movement; American Corn Growers Association; American Federation of Government Employees (AFL-CIO), Local 3354, USDA-St. Louis (representing Rural Development and Farm Loan employees in Missouri, Oklahoma, and Kansas); American Grassfed Association; American Raw Milk Producers Pricing Association; Ashtabula-Lake-Geauga County Farmers Union; BioRegional Strategies; Buckeye Quality Beef Association

(Ohio); C.A.S.A. del Llano (TX) California Dairy Campaign; California Farmers Union; California Food & Justice Coalition; Campaign for Contract Agriculture Reform; Campaign for Family Farms and the Environment; Carolina Farm Stewardship Association; Cattle Producers of Louisiana; Cattle Producers of Washington; Center for Celebration of Creation; Center for Food Safety; Center for Rural Affairs; Chemung County Church Women United (NY); Chemung County Council of Churches (NY); Chemung County Council of Women (NY); Church Women United of Chemung County (NY); Church Women United of New York State; Citizens for Sanity.Com, Inc.; Citizens for Sludge-Free Land; Colorado Independent CattleGrowers Association; Community Alliance for Global Justice; Community Farm Alliance (Kentucky); Community Food Security Coalition; Contract Poultry Growers Association of the Virginias; Court St Joseph #139, Coming/Elmira, Catholic Daughters of the Americas, Corning, NY; Crawford Stewardship Project; Cumberland Counties for Peace & Justice; Dakota Resource Council; Dakota Rural Action; Davidson College Office of Sustainability; Ecological Farming Association; Endangered Habitats League; Family Farm Defenders; Farm Aid; Farm and Ranch Freedom Alliance; Farmworker Association of Florida; Fay-Penn Economic Development Council; Federation of Southern Cooperatives; Food & Water Watch; Food Chain Workers Alliance; Food Democracy Now!; Food for Maine's Future; Gardenshare: Healthy Farms, Healthy Food, Everybody Eats;

Georgia Poultry Justice Alliance; Grassroots International; Heartland Center/Office of Peace and Justice for the Diocese of Gary, Indiana and the Integrity of Creation; Hispanic Organizations Leadership Alliance; Idaho Rural Council; Illinois Stewardship Alliance; Independent Beef Association of North Dakota (I-BAND); Independent Cattlemen of Nebraska; Independent Cattlemen of Wyoming; Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy; Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement; Iowa Farmers Union; Island Grown Initiative Izaak Walton League; Kansas Cattlemen's Association.

Kansas Farmers Union; Kansas Rural Center; Ladies of Charity of Chemung County (NY); Land Stewardship Project; Main Street Opportunity Lab; Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns; Michael Fields Agricultural Institute; Michigan Farmers Union; Michigan Land Trustees; Michigan Organic Food and Farm Alliance; Midwest Environmental Advocates; Midwest Organic Dairy Producers Association; Minnesota Farmers Union; Missionary Society of St. Columban; Mississippi Livestock Markets Association; Missouri Farmers Union; Missouri Rural Crisis Center; National Catholic Rural Life Conference; National Family Farm Coalition; National Farmers Organization; National Farmers Union; National Latino Farmers & Ranchers Trade Association; National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition; Nebraska Farmers Union; Nebraska Sustainable Agriculture Society; Nebraska Wildlife Federation; Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility; New England Small Farm Institute; Nonviolent Economics; North Carolina Contract Poultry Growers Association;

Northeast Organic Dairy Producers Alliance; Northeast Organic Farming Association—NY; Northeast Organic Farming Association, Interstate Council; Northern Plains Resource Council; Northwest Atlantic Marine Alliance; Ohio Ecological Food and Farm Association; Ohio Environmental Stewardship Alliance; Ohio Farmers Union; Oregon Livestock Producers Association; Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility; Oregon Rural Action; Oregon Consumers Association; Organic Farming Research Foundation; Organic Seed Alliance; Organization for Competitive Markets; Partnership for Earth Spirituality; Past Regents Club, Catholic Daughters of the Americas, Diocese of Rochester, NY; PCC Natural Markets; Pennsylvania Farmers Union; Pennypack Farm and Education Center (PA); Pesticide Action Network North America; Pomona Grange #1, Chemung County NY; Powder River Basin Resource Council (WY); R-CALF United Stockgrowers of America; Rocky Mountain Farmers Union; Rural Advancement Foundation International—USA (RAFI-USA); Rural Coalition; Sisters of St. Francis of Philadelphia; Slow Food USA; South Dakota Livestock Auction Markets Association; South Dakota Stockgrowers Association; St John the Baptist Fraternity of the Secular Franciscan Order, Elmira, NY; Sustain LA; Taos County Economic Development Corporation; Texas Farmers Union; The Cornucopia Institute; Tilth Producers of Washington; Trappe Landing Farm & Native Sanctuary; Veteran Grange #1118, Chemung County, NY; Virginia Association for Biological Farming; Western Organization of Resource Councils (WORC); WhyHunger; Women, Food and Agriculture Network.

The meatpackers have a stranglehold on this House, scaring Members with millions of dollars in campaign contributions and real threats of political retribution. Instead of engaging in well-meaning public debate and attempting to win on the merits of the argument, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, which has a right to speak out, but not a right to intimidate, sent out a national notice to its members to harass the American Farm Bureau. This is not the nature of well-meaning debate and, for many, has crossed the line of propriety.

I urge my colleagues to resist the misinformation and to stand strong for independent producers and family farmers and ranchers.

Section 721 of the base bill goes further than many realize. It will stop USDA from conducting its economic analysis of this industry.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman so very much for that kind effort.

The current proposal will silence the nearly 60,000 comments on the rule because it will prevent USDA from read-

ing the record. And, finally, it will undermine long overdue fairness in poultry and livestock contracts for millions of farmers, ranchers and producers.

By allowing section 721 to remain in the bill, the House is standing with the few big meatpackers and against the many thousands and thousands of producers.

To understand how illogical this committee's action is, I refer the House to the committee report where, on competition issues, the committee directed USDA to submit legal documents by June 10, 5 days ago, and before the House began consideration of this bill. On its face, the committee has directed the agency to comply with something before the House has even considered the bill. Is this proper?

Furthermore, I would note that, ironically, if section 721 were to be implemented, the agency would not be able to comply with its own report language. If there ever was a time that the Appropriations Committee has overstepped its bounds, this is it.

After the 2002 farm bill, this committee prevented USDA from implementing an important provision of law known as the Country of Origin labeling. It was the same consolidated meat packing industry crying from the rafters with claims of exaggerated economic costs which was behind the meat labeling COOL delay. We seem to have returned to the dark days, recycling the same talking points.

It took us almost 8 years and, finally, consumers now have the legal right to see where their meat comes from, which is what the vast majority of the American people wanted. So on behalf of the millions of farmers, ranchers and independent producers, I pledge to continue this fight and to prevent a similar 8 years of delay and confusion on USDA competition rules in the meat industry.

Let USDA do its job.

I thank the gentleman and the gentlewoman so much for their consideration.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlelady for her attention to this matter, both gentleladies for their attention to this matter and for standing up with and for the best interests of agriculture.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I submit the following:

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY  
H.R. 2112—AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT,  
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012

(REP. ROGERS, R-KY)

The Administration has serious concerns about the content of H.R. 2112, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes. The Administration is committed to ensuring the Nation lives within its means and reducing the deficit so that the Nation can compete in the global economy and win the future. That is why the President put forth a comprehensive fiscal framework that reduces the deficit by \$4 trillion,

supports economic growth and long-term job creation, protects critical investments, and meets the commitments made to provide dignity and security to Americans no matter their circumstances.

While overall funding limits and subsequent allocations remain unclear pending the outcome of ongoing bipartisan, bicameral discussions between the Administration and congressional leadership on the Nation's long-term fiscal picture, the bill provides insufficient funding for a number of programs in a way that undermines core government functions and investments key to economic growth and job creation. Programs adversely affected by the bill include:

Food and Nutrition Service (FNS). The Administration strongly objects to the level of funding provided for nutrition programs that are critical to the health of nutritionally at-risk women, infants, children, and elderly adults. The proposed funding levels would lead to hundreds of thousands of participants being cut from the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, and reduce Federal support for food banks. These cuts would undermine efforts to prevent hunger and support sound nutrition for some of the most vulnerable members of our society.

Food Safety. The Administration is concerned with the funding provided in the bill for the Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) which will significantly hamper USDA's ability to inspect food processing plants and prevent food borne illnesses and disease such as E. coli and Salmonella from contaminating America's food supply. The Committee's recommendation may require the agency to furlough employees including frontline inspectors which make up over 80 percent of FSIS staff. By reducing FSIS inspections, food processing plants may be forced to reduce line speeds, which could lead to decreasing product output and profits, as well as plant closures.

Healthy Food Financing Initiative (HFFI). The Administration is concerned that the bill does not support HFFI, which is a key initiative to combat childhood obesity. HFFI will expand USDA's activities to bring healthy foods to low-income Americans and increase the availability of affordable, healthy foods in underserved urban and rural communities by bringing grocery stores and other fresh food retailers to "food desert" communities where there is little or no access to healthy food.

Research. The bill provides insufficient funds for USDA research programs, which are needed to help solve food production, safety, quality, energy and environmental problems. By reducing funding for the Agricultural Research Service to its lowest level since 2004 as well as inadequately funding the Nation's competitive grant program, the bill will hinder the Department's ability to develop solutions to address current as well as impending critical national and international challenges.

Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The Administration is concerned that the funding level in the bill and resulting staff reductions will severely limit the FDA's ability to protect the public's health, assure the American consumer that food and medical products are safe, and improve Americans' access to safe and less costly generic drugs and biologics.

Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC). The Administration strongly objects to the funding level for CFTC, as it would cause a cut in staffing levels and seriously undermine CFTC's ability to protect investors and consumers by effectively policing the futures and swaps marketplace through

its current market oversight and enforcement functions. Moreover, the funding level would significantly curtail the timely, effective implementation of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, including new CFTC responsibilities to regulate the \$300 trillion swaps derivatives market.

International Food Aid. The Administration opposes the level of funding provided for the Food for Peace Title II international food aid program as it would severely limit the United States' ability to provide food assistance in response to emergencies and disasters around the world. Given a statutory floor on non-emergency development food aid, a reduction would be borne entirely by the emergency component of the program, and would prevent distribution of emergency food aid to over 1.1 million beneficiaries.

In addition, the bill includes the following problematic policy and language issues:

Restrictions on Finalizing USDA Regulations. The Administration opposes the inclusion of section 721 of the bill, which effectively prevents USDA's Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration from finalizing a rule on conduct that would violate the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921. The final rule has not yet been published and any concerns about the rule are better addressed through the standard rule-making process than through an appropriations rider.

Restrictions on FDA Regulations and Guidance. The Administration strongly opposes section 740 of the bill, which would undermine or nullify FDA statutory standards that have been in place for decades and that are essential to protect the health of Americans. The provision would unduly limit the factors that FDA considers in determining the best ways to protect the public from unsafe foods; protect the safety of the blood supply from HIV, West Nile Virus, and other infections; ensure the safety of infant formula; protect patients from drugs and medical devices that have not been shown to be safe and effective; assure that food labeling and health claims on foods are accurate; and reduce youth use of tobacco products and otherwise reduce illness and death caused by tobacco use.

WTO Trade Dispute. The Administration is concerned by a provision in section 743 that would eliminate payments that are being made as part of the mutually agreed settlement of a World Trade Organization (WTO) dispute regarding U.S. domestic cotton supports and the export credit guarantee program. The framework serves as a basis to avoid trade-related countermeasures by Brazil that are authorized by the WTO until the enactment of successor legislation to the current Farm Bill. Under the agreement, the United States is committed to fund technical assistance and capacity-building support for Brazil's cotton sector. The bill's provision preempts the resolution process and would open the door to retaliation negatively affecting U.S. exports and interests.

The Administration strongly opposes inclusion of ideological and political provisions that are beyond the scope of funding legislation.

The Administration looks forward to working with the Congress as the fiscal year 2012 appropriations process moves forward to ensure the Administration can support enactment of the legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to provide benefits described in section 1001D(b)(1)(C) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308-3a(b)(1)(C)) to a person or legal entity in excess of \$125,000.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, these are challenging budgets and difficult economic times. But unfortunately, there really are alternatives to slashing environmental payments and nutritional support in the farm bill. There is an alternative to reform and modernize.

The last farm bill pretended to start limitations in payments. But exempted from the modest limitations in some areas were market loan payments, loan deficiency payments, and commodity certificates not capped. This means that entities can virtually receive unlimited title I dollars under the current law.

Mr. Chairman, it's important for us, as we are dealing with trying to reduce the strain on the Federal budget, to do so in a way that is strategic. The amendment I propose would establish a \$125,000 payment limitation in total. Now, this will save two-thirds of a billion dollars.

Bear in mind that we are now cutting existing environmental contracts if this bill came forward. The majority of farmers and ranchers in this country still receive nothing, 62 percent receive nothing. In my State of Oregon, it's 87 percent of the farmers and ranchers. It's time to start with modest restrictions on government subsidies.

There are a wide range of areas in this budget. As it's working its way through the House, we're going to see very dramatic reductions, almost a third in transportation. We sliced \$1 billion from sewer and water programs to State and local governments. At a time of record high farm commodity prices, this would be a time to place this modest limitation.

There's actually a question whether or not some of these payments even go to farmers at all. In 2009, some of the entities that received title I hand-outs—the Fidelity National Title Institute received over \$4.85 million. Almost \$3 million went to the Mercer County

Abstract Company. The American Marketing Peanut Association received largesse from the Federal Government worth over \$3.98 million.

□ 2300

These aren't the small family farmers that I think all of us would like to support.

In this day and age, it's embarrassing to be giving away \$4 million of taxpayer money in 1 year to a private, for-profit company when I think what we should be doing is concentrating on the support for America's farmers and ranchers. We have the opportunity, with this amendment, to take a step in this direction.

I would strongly urge that my colleagues join with me in adopting this amendment establishing a \$125,000 overall limit, and be able to start saving two-thirds of \$1 billion and send a signal that we're serious about reforming spending.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would have far-reaching and devastating effects for America's farmers. I'm not sure the gentleman is aware of the full extent of this amendment.

This amendment throws the Non-insured Crop Disaster Program into an arbitrary payment limit scheme. This program, in which farmers pay a fee to obtain crop insurance coverage, protects them from catastrophic events like flooding and tornados. If this amendment passes, farmers who have been flooded out are quite literally up a creek without a paddle. They won't get the coverage they've signed up for even though they've paid in.

This amendment would also affect the permanent disaster program. Producers were required to purchase crop insurance to be eligible for that program. This amendment would be a bait and switch—they've fulfilled their end of the bargain, but we're pulling the rug out from under them now.

There's a time and a place to debate the appropriate level of support for farmers. I welcome that debate as a part of the 2012 farm bill process which will in effect begin next week. The Agriculture Committee will be auditing farm programs for effectiveness and efficiency, and then we will seek input from across the country on the best way to support our farmers and ranchers while making good use of taxpayer dollars.

Discussing farm programs in the context of a farm bill will represent honest, transparent policymaking. This amendment prevents that discussion from taking place by altering the terms of the contracts with farmers once they've already been signed. Pro-

tecting farmers during catastrophic weather events is the least we can do to maintain a stable food supply in our country.

My colleagues in the Midwest have seen firsthand the devastation that comes with flooding. My colleagues in the Southwest know how droughts can turn healthy farms into desolation. For that reason alone, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. But I also urge you to oppose it because policy changes like this should be conducted within the broader context of all farm bill policy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of Chairman LUCAS.

In the 2008 farm bill, we spent a lot of time working through this payment limitation issue. There were a lot of different ideas and a lot of different discussions, and it was not easy. We made significant reforms in this payment limitation area, and as the chairman indicated, we came to a resolution and people are relying on that. We've got a 5-year farm bill. People make decisions not from year to year; they make them in the long term, and it's just not fair to come in and change things in the middle of the stream.

One of the other things we did is we applied the payment limitations to all of the programs, and as I understand this amendment, it only applies to the commodity title. So we're once again going to create a different set of payment limitations for one part of the farm program compared to another.

I don't know exactly what the purpose of this is because the farm programs are not designed to be a welfare program or to pick winners and losers and decide how big a farm is going to be and all that sort of stuff. The purpose of these farm programs is to support production agriculture so we can feed this country and, frankly, feed the world. You read all these stories coming from all over the world that we're worried that we're not going to have enough food to feed all of the increase in population and all that stuff. If you go down this track, you're going to go down a policy that's going to make it very difficult for us to feed the world.

So this is ideology run amok. Some people have problems with the way we've designed this safety net. And I think we could do a better job, but this is just the wrong thing to do. This is too complicated an issue to settle here on the floor in a few minutes of debate. And it's just not fair to the people that have made long-term decisions, have invested a lot of money based on expecting that this farm bill was going to be in this form until September 30,

2012. So I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HIMES. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Oregon.

And with all due respect to the ranking member, I think the effort to limit these subsidies is both fiscally responsible, more in keeping with the kind of market economics that so many of us in this Chamber believe are the right way to go, and will help the health of the American people, something that will have a dramatic impact on the rising health care costs in this country.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would limit the total title I payments to farm entities to less than \$125,000 a year. It doesn't eliminate them; it simply limits them. Under current law, market loan payments, loan deficiency payments, and commodity certificates are not capped, and entities can receive unlimited title I dollars.

Mr. Chairman, 4 hours ago in this Chamber, we debated amendments that would eliminate and gut the WIC program, WIC—women, infants and children. This is a program that seeks to provide basic food to poor children, to poor families.

There were amendments that would eliminate the Food for Peace program whereby we send food—in those bags that we've all seen, "A gift from the people of the United States of America"—to people who are starving around this planet, a gift from the people of the United States of America at a moment when we can use friends. And we said we're going to gut them, we're going to reduce them. Why would you do that? You would only do that if you face the kind of budget constraints that we face today. A brutal necessity to find savings.

Here we have an opportunity to save nearly \$1 billion in subsidies to large producers. These are not small farmers, as my colleague from Oregon said. The top 10 percent of subsidy recipients receive almost three-quarters of these funds. This is not the small farmer; these are big conglomerates.

These subsidies are bailouts. We hear a lot about bailouts in this Chamber. And nobody thinks bailouts are a good thing. These are slow-motion, year-in-and-year-out bailouts of an industry.

Many of my colleagues support both the goals of fiscal responsibility and the idea that markets are efficient. Here, not only are we taking taxpayer dollars and sending them to a slow motion, perpetual bailout, but we're doing it in such a way that it creates cheap corn sugars and other things that go into the fast-food that exacerbate the obesity problem in this country. This is a bad idea. And I urge my colleagues to support this amendment for both fiscal health and sheer market grounds.



I yield to my colleague from Oregon.  
Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his kind words and thoughtful analysis.

□ 2310

The approach that we are taking here is to put an overall limit of \$125,000 in addition to what we are talking about. This would have only affected about 6,500 entities in 2009. It is an appropriate step forward.

I hear some of my colleagues concerned about changing the rules for a few thousand people who are getting huge amounts of subsidy. You know, this bill will change the rules for tens of thousands of farmers and ranchers who would otherwise get environmental protections, payments for environmental programs. In fact, some of the existing contracts would be abrogated.

Now, there are going to be lots of changes going on. I hope that we start now beginning the process of agricultural reform and making clear that we want to start by putting some overall limitation during a time of record high farm prices. There is never a good time to do it. I think the time to do it is now.

I look forward to a spirited debate on farm bill reform. I hope at some point we are able to actually do some meaningful reform, as acknowledged by even the proponents from the committee. We have got lots of problems with the existing bill. We could do a better job. It is complicated.

Well, this isn't complicated. This is straightforward and direct, and I urge an "aye" vote in support of the amendment.

Mr. HIMES. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, once again we have come to a point where I need to defend the work of the Ag Committee, the authorizing committee, the committee that knows the most about this process.

The \$125,000 limit is picked out of whole cloth. It is made up. It is arbitrary. It is capricious. It has no clue what it might have as an impact on the farmers and ranchers in the district and parts that I represent. It is a drive-by shooting of farm policy that, frankly, makes no sense whatsoever if you are really going to seriously protect the production of agriculture in this country.

On the one hand, we hear our colleagues on the other side rant about imported foods, and they want to then turn around and make sure that the American farmer and producer does not have the safety net that we promised them in 2008. Now, I understand my colleagues don't like that safety net. They had ample opportunity when they were in the majority in 2008 to effect a farm bill when it came to this floor. If

they didn't like the process, they needed to take that up with Speaker PELOSI and them.

The process going forward that I anticipate happening next year is that we will begin, as the chairman has said, to audit these farm bill programs over the next several months. We will then craft, with limited resources, a new farm bill that will be introduced in the committee, debated through subcommittees and at the full committee, and then we will bring it to the floor. It will be exposed to all of these arguments in an appropriate manner that should take place, not in the appropriations process.

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle did not vote for the budget we passed here in April. That budget clearly said the appropriations process in 2012 would not be used to effect a farm bill, that the farm bill would be written by the Agriculture Committee, the authorizing committee in 2012.

My colleagues' arguments are unpersuasive, and I do believe this is an ill-advised amendment to go at a safety net that, by every description, is complicated, is difficult to understand, but it has worked to protect production of agriculture from the risks that they take year in and year out to provide the safest, most abundant and cheapest food and fiber source of any developed country in the world.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Blumenauer amendment. It is the wrong policy at the wrong time and the wrong place.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Again, I think that this is an amendment that is ill-conceived. I think it will do great harm, and I think it is not timely. I agree with the gentleman that the authorizing committee has great expertise. We have taken a lot of time to vet this program, and I think for us to come tonight willy-nilly and do it is very, very ill advised.

Nineteen years ago when I came to this body I was on the authorizing committee, on the Agriculture Committee, and the chairman of the committee at that time was a gentleman by the name of Kika de la Garza. Mr. de la Garza was fond of telling us one of his life experiences, and that was his submarine story.

He said that all of his life, from the time he was a little boy, even though he grew up in the rural areas in Texas on the farm, that he wanted to ride on a submarine. He always was just enamored with submarines. Finally, after he came to Congress and after he became the chairman of a committee, he had an opportunity to go out on one of our nuclear submarines. Of course, as the guest, he was allowed to take the wheel and to submerge the submarine, to get it up, to play with the periscope, and

he was just really, really amazed at how impressive that nuclear submarine was. So he turned to the captain and he asked the captain, he said, Captain, how long can this nuclear submarine stay underwater without coming up? It is so fine, we have spent so much money and it is an excellent machine. The captain looked at him and said, Mr. Chairman, how long would you guess? And Mr. de la Garza said he thought for a while, and he said, Well, maybe a year? And the captain chuckled and said, Mr. Chairman, we can stay underwater for as long as we have food for the crew.

We in this country will be able to defend ourselves and we will be able to have a strong country as long as we have food, and right now we are headed to getting imported food for the majority of our people. If we continue with the route that we are going, if we impose these limitations, if we limit the ability of our farmers to compete on a level playing field with our global competitors, all of our food will be coming from Mexico and South America and China.

We cannot afford for that to happen. America cannot stay strong. Our people cannot be healthy. We cannot get safe food if we don't allow our farmers to have the capacity to earn a living and to produce the highest quality, the safest and most economical food and fiber anywhere in the industrialized world.

We have to defeat these amendments. We have to studiously and assiduously study the way to reform these programs and to get cost-effectiveness. But tonight in this bill is not the place to do it. The time to do it is when we take up the farm bill in 2012 with the authorizing committee and all others having the opportunity to take our time and to thoughtfully craft a new farm policy.

With that, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of my friend, my colleague from Oregon's amendment this evening.

I am not sure if a \$125,000 payment limitation is the right amount, but this isn't a new concept. There has been a lot of discussion about payment limitations under title I, and the gentleman is correct. The time to start doing this is now.

We can pretend that there aren't major policy changes being made under this agricultural appropriations bill, but there are. There are deep cuts in the conservation title. We just had a large consortium, a coalition of outdoor sporting groups, write a letter expressing their concern about the deep cuts in the voluntary and incentive-based land and water conservation programs and the impact that is going to



have on quality water and habitat protection or the ability of our farmers to be good stewards of their land. There is a huge demand for these programs which will be dramatically affected with the deep spending reductions that are contained in this appropriation bill.

The same goes for the nutrition programs. The huge funding reductions will have an impact on tens of thousands of families throughout the Nation, low-income children that rely on these programs, the Women, Infants, and Children program in particular, seniors on these nutrition programs. They are going to feel the effects of the decisions that we are making in this Agriculture appropriation bill.

Now, for so many of my colleagues to stand up this evening and claim we can't mess with title I program funding, we should wait for the next farm bill, I think, is disingenuous at best.

I ask my colleagues tonight, mohair subsidies? Is that the best we are going to be able to do? And I would submit to my colleagues that the reason why mohair was picked on is because they are not a particularly well-organized, sophisticated, politically-connected entity out there, so it was easy to go after them, as my colleague from Utah showed with his amendment.

But we have known for a long time now that these subsidy programs under title I do distort the marketplace. They do distort our trade policy, as my Brazil cotton subsidy amendment highlighted a little earlier this evening. And we are long past time to start making these revisions in light of the huge budget deficits that we are facing.

□ 2320

When 80 percent of the producers in our Nation get nothing under title I subsidies—not a dime—that leaves a very small group of entities that is receiving the bulk of these taxpayer subsidies, and we all know who they are. They're the big five grain-producing entities of this country—corn, soybeans, cotton, rice, and wheat. They're the ones who are receiving the bulk of these title I subsidy programs.

Under the farm bill, there are multiple programs which they can be eligible for: from the LDP Program, to Countercyclical, to the new ACRE Program under the last farm bill, to the Direct Payment Program. Many of us were arguing in the last farm bill whether it was necessary to go forward with direct payments that bear no relationship to current market prices—all based on past production history.

Today, we are facing world record commodity prices in these categories. Not only did we continue them, but we increased the direct payments, and we're allowing double entities on the same fund to qualify for the direct payments. Yet none of that is being discussed in the context of this Agriculture appropriations bill.

As to my original point, I'm not sure if 125 is the right level, but the concept

isn't new, and it's definitely a step in the right direction. I think it's trying to bring more sanity to the title I subsidy programs, which we shouldn't be delaying until the next farm bill which may or may not happen next year. We know it's tough to get major pieces of legislation through during an election year, let alone a Presidential election year. It could be years from now before we have the next farm bill ready to go with any potential change.

So I commend my colleague for offering this amendment and for continuing the discussion, and I encourage my colleagues to seriously consider supporting it. I'm sure the Senate will have some ideas, too, on things that they recommend.

This, I think, is appropriate and it's not new; and to claim that we shouldn't touch title I, yet we're eviscerating virtually the rest of the farm bill in what we're doing with this appropriations bill, I think is disingenuous.

I would be happy to yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's words, and I appreciate his courtesy.

I listened with amusement to my friend from Georgia talk about his concern that we're going to be importing food from overseas if we have some reasonable limitation on these title I payments.

The food, which are the fruits and vegetables that the people in my State raise—and I met with a bunch of them this last week again—get zip. They get nada. We're cutting back on the research funding for them. We're cutting back on marketing. We're cutting back on helping them comply with the environmental requirements that they want to meet because they're good stewards of the land. We're making it harder for them to do the work of producing food for America. Yet we're having lavish subsidies for five commodities, which is where 90 percent of the money goes.

If you really cared about protecting the food supply, we'd redirect it. We'd save this \$650 million, and we'd put it where it would do more good.

Mr. KIND. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I just wanted to clarify that it was discussed that what we were trying to do was to get the top 20 recipients off of the EWG Web site, and I just got a copy of it.

Four of the top 10 recipients actually are title or law firms that did work for WRP. The top one is Fidelity National Title at \$4.8 million. That is all work that was done on WRP contracts. It

looks to me like six of the top 20 are actually abstract and title firms that did work on conservation WRP contracts that are not affected by this amendment, so that's a problem.

You're throwing all these statistics around and claiming that these big guys are getting all this money. But these aren't even farmers. These are law firms. Maybe we should have payment limitations on law firms. That might be a good thing. Maybe we should only let these guys do \$125,000 worth of WRP work so that we can spread it around a little bit and make it more fair. That's the other problem with this whole concept.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I wasn't going to rise on this amendment—and I probably shouldn't—but this discussion just bugs me.

I represent more productive agriculture in my district than anyone in this room—\$4 billion in just one county—and I represent a bunch of counties. What we grow are specialty crops. We grow 85 crops in Monterey County. As we were talking about earlier, 58 percent of all the lettuce in the United States is grown in that county. We grow 35 different varieties of wine grapes, and we are the leading counties in strawberry production and in a bunch of berry productions. In fact, our motto there is that we're the "salad bowl capital of the world," which includes all of the ingredients in salad—celery, lettuce. All those things, we grow.

Do you know what? They don't get a dime of support from the Federal Government. If the market falls, they eat it. If a disaster comes in, they eat it.

So the reason these amendments are brought up by Mr. KIND and Mr. BLUMENAUER year after year is that, frankly—do you know what?—the farm bill doesn't address this issue. It really doesn't. It's too tough—it's too politically tough—and there are too many vested interests in this town. You have a whole bunch of agriculture out there, and some people would suggest that more than all of the money created in commodity supports is in what they call "specialty crops," and that's the stuff you eat all the time.

You can't have this bifurcated world out there where you have a bunch of people who are essentially on welfare and a bunch of people who are just assuming all the risk. What really surprises me is that, with the conservative side of the aisle over here that really is driven toward market approaches to solve problems, this is not a market approach. This is a subsidy. It's a taxpayer subsidy, and it's going to very wealthy people in some cases.

So I am rising to say this amendment, as in the past, gets defeated; but

these gentlemen have an issue, and I just beg with the leaders. I've got great respect for the ranking member of the Ag Committee here on our side of the aisle. I know he can wrestle with these problems. He's a CPA. He knows these things.

I think the handwriting is on the wall. If the conservatives on your side of the aisle would take this on as an issue that Americans are really going to address, we may get some progress on the farm bill. If you don't, you're abandoning your marketing concepts, and you're abandoning what is needed in modern America.

Just remember, that apple, that pear, that banana in there, that celery, the strawberries—the list goes on and on with all the fruits and vegetables—they don't get any of these payments. So let's not have a bifurcated agricultural production out there where half of it depends on taxpayer payments and the other half has to just live by market forces. Let's have everybody a lot more influenced by market forces.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make payments (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to make payments) under section 201 of the Claims Resolution Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-291; 124 Stat. 3070), relating to the final settlement of claims from *In re Black Farmers Discrimination Litigation*, or section 14012 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 2209).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment emanates from claims that were filed subsequent to a press conference held by then-Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman in 1995, who said that the USDA was discriminating against black farmers. I believe that happened. Their estimate at the USDA at that time was that there were approximately 3,000 black farmers who would file claims under what resulted in a consent decree in the late nineties.

□ 2330

The 3,000 estimate became 22,551 claims of discrimination. But accord-

ing to the census, there are 18,000 black farmers. According to the testimony of the president of the Black Farmers Association before the Judiciary Committee, there are 18,000 black farmers. Well, the 18,000 black farmers estimating 3,000 claims of discrimination became 22,551 claims. That was Pigford I. And \$1.05 billion was paid out then to settle all of the claims that were there. There was an argument made that others didn't get filed. But it always was a number greater than the actual number of black farmers. And you can't have more black farmers discriminated against than there actually are.

They tried to open up Pigford II. This Congress didn't act on it in an affirmative way between the House and the Senate until late last fall in a lame duck session. President Barack Obama introduced legislation as a junior Senator from Illinois in 1989 and 2007, and was instrumental in pushing this through in a lame duck session that appropriated \$1.15 billion to pay out claims.

Now we have not 3,000 claims. We still have 18,000 black farmers. Now we have 94,000 claims and report after report of fraudulent claims and marketing this as perpetuation of a fraud across this country. And my amendment shuts off the funding that would be used to administer or to fund the balance of these Pigford II claims, which this Congress must investigate the fraud that's here.

By the way, Shirley Sherrod, who was fired by the Secretary of Agriculture, was the largest recipient and the largest civil rights claim in the history of America, with \$13 million for her claim. Three days later, Tom Vilsack hired her to work for the USDA. Later, he fired her. Later, he hired her back. Then she sued Andrew Breitbart. All of these things are information that we need to find out. This Congress cannot be paying out another \$1.15 billion in good money going after bad claims. We have reports and videotape. One is a class counsel who had his own videotape and says that he has 3,000 clients who have filed discrimination claims, and least 10 percent of them are fraudulent claims. A class counsel, who was included in this second agreement, which by the way, the court has not finally approved.

So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment shuts off the funding that would be used to pay these claims, the funding that would be used to administer these claims, and it gives this Congress an opportunity to look into what has been done to the taxpayer here in America. And so I urge adoption of my amendment. I believe that I have explained what it amounts to, although it has been very intensively in the news over the last year or so.

I would urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. The opportunities for Members to have amendments is a privilege that should not be denied. And I respect my colleague from Iowa for his right to offer an amendment. But it is tragic and disappointing that my friend from Iowa, who served with me on the Judiciary Committee, would take this time to demean the tragic lives that black farmers, Native Americans farmers, and others impacted have experienced over several decades; to raise the name of Shirley Sherrod, whose eloquent story and painful story of the loss of her father in the segregated South, who was murdered, and the family had to survive after his tragic murder because of his color—to my knowledge, a farmer, man of the Earth.

I sat on the Judiciary Committee for a number of years, and this legislation proceeded through the Judiciary Committee. I join the gentleman in wanting to ensure the adequacy of the implementation of this settlement. I want to stand alongside a transparent system. But this was a lawsuit that many of the litigants died before they even got to the settlement. This is the American way—a battle in the courts, a settlement—had it not been for the good will of Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, members of the Congressional Black Caucus who joined with members of the Democratic Caucus, Republicans, past Presidents, who were concerned and interested in the devastation tragedy of the segregated South and a segregated Department who treated black farmers in a disparate way from others. Individuals who went bankrupt, who lost farms because they could not get the same access to agricultural loans that others could. And in the wisdom of the court system and the wisdom of this body and the wisdom of a settlement, relief was brought not before many had died and their heirs, trembling, limited, scattered, few, were able to come together and receive the funding.

I'm sorry Mr. KING was not at the signing of that final settlement and to see those historic families, patriots, who expressed nothing but love for this country. What a tragedy to come and interfere with an existing settlement. I don't even know how he can put this amendment up on the floor. It's late. We're losing our voices here. But I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize that there's nothing wrong with ensuring that the Agriculture Department and the surrounding entities that are dealing with the distribution of these funds be transparent and without fraud.

But it would be absurd for any Member to join and to vote to interfere with the legitimate settlement of legitimate claims that have evidenced the pain and devastation and disregard and disparate treatment and discrimination and unconstitutional treatment of farmers who we claim on this floor today to love. Farming is part of the American fabric. And if there's any

body of people who understands farms, it is the ex-slaves who worked for 400 years without payment in the cotton fields of the South.

I ask my colleagues to consider opposing this amendment, and I rise respectfully to oppose it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, *Pigford v. Glickman* was a class action discrimination suit between the USDA and black farmers. The suit was filed by an estimated 2,000 black farmers who said that USDA discriminated against them in loan programs. A settlement agreement was approved in 1999.

The suit claimed that USDA discriminated against black farmers on the basis of race and failed to investigate or properly respond to complaints from 1983 to 1997.

The deadline for submitting a claim was September 12, 2000. However, a large number of applicants filed late and reported deficiencies in representation by class counsel.

Consequently, the 2008 farm bill (PL 110-246) permitted any claimant who had submitted a late-filing request under *Pigford* and who hadn't previously obtained a determination on the merits of their claim should obtain a determination. A maximum of \$100 million in mandatory spending was made available for payments of these claims in the 2008 farm bill.

The multiple claims that were subsequently filed by over 25,000 black farmers were consolidated into a single case, *In re Black Farmers Discrimination Litigation* (commonly referred to as *Pigford II*).

On February 18, 2010, Attorney General Holder and Secretary Vilsack announced a \$1.25 billion settlement of these *Pigford II* claims.

The *Pigford II* settlement provides both a fast-track settlement process and high payments to potential claimants who go through a more rigorous review and documentation process.

Potential claimants can seek the fast-track payments of up to \$50,000 plus debt relief, or choose the longer process damages of up to \$250,000.

Finally, our Nation's black farmers who were discriminated against by their own government have received some modicum of justice.

Despite years of political gamesmanship that prevented us from finding a fair resolution, thousands of families who have waited for the settlements will now receive them.

We cannot deny them this basic justice.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, or any other Federal Agency receiving funds under this Act to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. On May 24, President Obama issued a memorandum on Federal fleet performance, which requires that all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015.

□ 2340

My amendment simply echoes the Presidential memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Agriculture appropriations bill from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum.

Two weeks ago, I introduced a similar amendment to the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill that was accepted by both parties and passed by voice vote unanimously.

Our transportation sector is by far the biggest reason we send \$600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs, but America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal fleet, with almost 38,000 belonging to the Department of Agriculture. Supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet will encourage development of domestic energy resources, including biomass, natural gas, coal, agricultural waste, hydrogen, and renewable electricity.

Expanding the role these energy sources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies and will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world's oil markets. I ask that we all support my amendment.

The chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, and I cochair the Oil and National Security Caucus, and we do it because we believe that America cannot be totally free unless we're energy independent and while we still have to rely on hostile foreign nations to get our fuel and to get our fuel supplies.

On a similar note, I have worked with my colleagues, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. ISRAEL, and for many years with Mr. KINGSTON to in-

troduce the bipartisan open fuel standard, H.R. 1687. It's similar to what I'm doing now.

I just wanted to briefly mention that our bill, not this amendment but our bill, would require 50 percent of new automobiles in 2014, 80 percent in 2016, and 95 percent in 2017 to be warranted to operate on non-petroleum fuels, in addition to or instead of petroleum-based fuels. It would cost \$100 or less per car to manufacture cars that would be flex fuel cars.

Compliance possibilities include the full array of existing technologies, including flex fuel, natural gas, hydrogen, biodiesel, plug-in electric drive, fuel cell, and a catch-all for new technologies.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Engel amendment and the open fuel standard as we work toward breaking our dependence on foreign oil. I thank Chairman KINGSTON for his courtesies, and I urge bipartisan support of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee informs me that he will accept the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for mifepristone, commonly known as RU-486, for any purpose.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is an amendment that comes and there's an Iowa focus on this that affects the whole country. We have had a practice that began experimentally in Iowa by Planned Parenthood of issuing telemed abortions by distributing RU-486, the abortion pill, what is also known as mifepristone, distributing it through a means of setting up a television monitor and it circumventing the requirement in Iowa that they be seen by a doctor. A doctor sits remotely on the other side of the Skype screen, so to speak, and interviews the potential mother, who if once she answers the questions that the doctor asks and they record it under film that they've protected themselves perhaps from liability, he clicks the mouse on the one end and it opens a drawer underneath the screen on the other end and out rolls the abortion pill, RU-486.

I am very concerned about the robo distribution of abortion pills in Iowa or anywhere else. Some of us signed a letter, 70 of us, to Kathleen Sebelius and asked if they had distributed grants for telemedicine to any of the abortion

providers, including Planned Parenthood. Their response came back in the affirmative, that they had issued several grants to Planned Parenthood; and these funds, as near as we can determine, are being used to provide telemedicine for the robo abortions, robo Skype abortions as I've described.

This amendment provides that none of the funds made available in this \$15 million telemedicine line item that's in this appropriations bill shall be used for the purpose of purchasing, prescribing, dispensing, procuring, or otherwise administering mifepristone, commonly known as RU-486.

I would just urge the body to pay attention to what this means for the country and understand that no one in America paying taxes should be compelled to pay for abortions if they are doing that. Skype-robo abortions are abhorrent. They're irresponsible. We have 14 deaths of moms that have come from this; 2,207 adverse events; 339 blood transfusions; and 612 hospitalizations.

This is a dangerous drug, and to distribute it through robo-Skype abortions—I'm opposed to it philosophically for a lot of reasons, but practical minds who might disagree on the abortion issue should understand that this government should not be paying for it. This amendment prohibits the use of these funds in the \$15 million line item from being used to provide telemedicine abortions.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR. Could you tell me where in the bill this has anything to do with what you're talking about?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I believe I did, but I would restate that there's a line item in the bill that provides \$15 million to go to grants for telemedicine.

Mr. FARR. That's not in the amendment that we have.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The amendment that I have put out here says: "None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for mifepristone, commonly known as RU-486, for any purpose."

And so I've specified why I'm concerned and why I address this language to the broader bill, but because there are grant funds available for telemedicine in the bill, that's why I'm concerned that this application that I've used could well go, and has gone according to Kathleen Sebelius, to those grants.

If the gentleman doesn't agree, I would think he neither would disagree with the amendment because, therefore, it wouldn't have an effect by the gentleman's interpretation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I know it's late, but I rise in opposition to this, because, first of all, using telemedicine by FDA I don't think is, one, illegal, or ill-wise. Secondly, I think what the gentleman is going to talk about is a legal drug in the United States. It's been a legitimate drug in the United States after it met all of the rigorous FDA process in 1996 and has been available since 2000 in this country.

I remember vigorous debates in this committee about the conditionality by which FDA would license this drug. It is legal and available in all 50 States in the United States, in Washington, DC, in Guam, and in Puerto Rico. It's a prescription drug which is not available to the public through pharmacies. Instead, its distribution is restricted to specifically qualified licensed physicians. To use it, a woman must go to a doctor's office.

Whatever controversy surrounded the introduction of RU-486 in the United States was settled years ago, and there's no reason for this amendment other than to stir up the controversy over the reproductive rights of women. I think by the gentleman's comments, you can see that that's what he's trying to do.

I would urge us all to oppose this amendment. And frankly it doesn't have anything to do with USDA funds, because we don't do telemedicine abortions.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

□ 2350

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLARKE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . Of the funds appropriated by division B of Public Law 111-117 under the heading "Economic Support Fund" for assistance for Afghanistan, \$7,700,000 shall be transferred to, and merged with, funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Agricultural Marketing Services, Marketing Services".

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mrs. LUMMIS. I object.

The Acting CHAIR. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment. I don't have a copy of it.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to let this Congress know and the American people know that I've identified a funding source so that we can provide nutritious food and fresh fruits and vegetables to those Americans who live in areas around this country that the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) so appropriately described as food deserts.

As a matter of fact, this government currently spends hundreds of millions of dollars to build agricultural businesses, to help support farmers, to help new farmers start new agricultural businesses in order to address food desert issues. Unfortunately, that money is not spent here to help Americans eat better. It's spent in the Afghanistan desert. As a matter of fact, in this previous fiscal year, this government spent over \$700 million on agricultural aid in Afghanistan. What I propose is to redirect 1 percent of that money that's going to Afghanistan right now, send it back to the United States so people here can eat nutritional food and have access to fresh fruits and vegetables.

And I would like to say one thing. The argument on why we're spending that kind of money to support farmers in Afghanistan is because we don't want those farmers growing poppies to sell opium to fund safe havens for terrorists. We understand that there are people around the world that want to attack this country like they did many years ago, but because bin Laden is now dead, it's time for us to reassess our mission in Afghanistan. We don't need to spend \$100 billion a year in Afghanistan right now. We need to take a share of that money to help the American people. So, if we took 1 percent of the money that we spent last year, we would be able to fund the program proposed by the gentlewoman from Texas.

Look, I've got young folks in the city of Detroit right now that would likely not have to resort to selling drugs if they could make a living in urban agriculture. We need that money that's going to Afghanistan. We need it right here in the United States so we can help our farmers here, so we can support farmers' markets, so we can provide food and nutritional supplements to our pregnant mothers and to their infants and children. Our people in the United States need a share of their own money back here, and that's why I wanted to rise to raise this point.

Now, I understand that the rules of this House may not allow me tonight to redirect that money from Afghanistan back here to this budget. And you

know what also, too? We could use a share of that money to help retire our deficit and debt at the same time. I'd like to work with you on that. But you know what we should do? We should change these darn rules of the House so we can reduce the overspending, help create jobs here, reduce health care costs—because people are going to be eating a lot better, and help the American people right now during this economic recession.

I'd like to work with you. I'd also like to work to change the rules of the House so that we can do this, and I understand at this late date this is not the time to act, but I'd like to pledge an agreement to work with the majority so that we can save the American people money, save us health care costs, provide better nutrition, address those food desert issues, fund the initiative proposed by the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and help end this economic recession and return us to prosperity.

With that, Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to promulgate any final rules under paragraphs (13) or (14) of section 2(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as added by section 727 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, until 12 months after the promulgation of final swap transaction reporting rules under section 21 of the Commodity Exchange Act.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. This is a protect retiree pensions and jobs by ensuring a well-functioning swaps market amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for your support today for my amendment which would do that—prevent unintended consequences from impacting literally millions of pension plan participants and the beneficiaries that follow. My amendment would simply require the CFTC to finalize important data-reporting rules before they implement new rules for certain swap transactions.

See, with this change, it would be able to collect the transaction data that it needs to determine the reasonable standards for block trade levels and real-time reporting requirements without first disrupting the marketplace. You see, finalizing any numerical determination of block trade sizes or setting real-time reporting require-

ment timeframes prior to having necessary data, really, if you think about it, would be arbitrary, would encourage litigation, and will likely have the unintended consequences on those very same pension funds I talked about—their ability to protect their investors, as well as on the economic growth of our country and job creation.

So, what this amendment would do is require swap data-reporting rules to be finalized and be in place before promulgating the final block trade rules or those real-time reporting criteria rules.

Now, I do this because numerous market participants of all shapes and sizes have sent to us public comment letters warning of the dangers of getting block trades and real-time rules wrong. I will just give you this one. I had others. I will just give you one of those letters, and that comes from the American Benefits Council. Who are they? Well, they and their members provide benefit services to over 100 million Americans in the Committee on Investment of Employee Benefit Assets, whose members include more than 100 of the country's largest pension funds and manage more than \$1 trillion on behalf of 15 million member plan participants and the beneficiaries.

I will just give you one quote from this, not all the other ones: We have concerns about the sequencing of proposed real-time reporting rules in relation to the collection of swap market information. We believe that they should first obtain market information via reporting of trades of swap data repositories—which have to be set up, of course—and then propose rules based on this data such as real-time reporting, which necessarily would better serve the intended purposes.

So, in conclusion, by instituting a more commonsense approach to these rule-makings, we're giving them the ability to collect that data of the swap transaction information to determine those reasonable block trade levels that they have to set, the real-time reporting requirement as well, and to do so in a way that will not impair the well-functioning of the marketplace.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment and move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman and Members, this is part of the continuing effort to delay the implementation of the Dodd-Frank Act as long as possible. We've seen some other examples of that. This section deals with public reporting swap data.

What people need to understand, the people that are most afraid of the public disclosure are not the people that are using this market. It's the banks. What this is really about and what this end-user debate that's been going on is about more than anything else is that

the public disclosure of this information will lower the spreads of the Wall Street banks that do these swaps. That's what's the bottom line of this whole deal.

□ 0000

If the market participants know more, like what we do in the exchange trading and so forth, the margins are going to come down and the profits of these big banks are going to shrink. In fact, some people have said that they think that once this is implemented that it's probably going to reduce the profits of the Wall Street banks 40 percent. And they don't like it, and they want to delay it.

So some would argue that we need more data collection, and I guess that's what you are arguing before this public reporting. I think for some swaps, that is the case, and I will agree with that. But on other swaps, the institutions are already collecting this data. They can go forward with this public reporting. We have the information. There's no reason to delay it. In other cases where we don't have the information, it probably isn't appropriate to delay it.

But the CFTC has the discretion to do this, and it's right in the law. It's on page 328 of the conference report. And we've put in there the criteria to allow them to move ahead with the swaps where we have the data and to delay it where we don't have the data. But what you are trying to do is you are going to delay the whole thing, and all it's going to do is ensure that these profits and these big bonuses that they're paying on Wall Street can go on longer than they need to.

So I don't know any reason why we need to do this. If you read this, they have all the discretion. All of the problems that people brought up with the block trades and these other things that people were concerned about are in there.

And the last thing it says: They have to take into account whether the public disclosure will materially reduce market liquidity. And they are doing that, and they are doing that as we're going through this process. And I believe that at the end of the day, it's going to be fine.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. So the gentleman agrees that there is only partial information at this point in time out there.

Mr. PETERSON. On some things.

Mr. GARRETT. On some things.

On other things, the gentleman would agree that there is no information out there at all on certain—

Mr. PETERSON. Well, I wouldn't say there isn't any information. Some of these are so thinly traded that you are never going to be able to have real-time reporting. We understand that, and there is not going to be a requirement on those. But there's no reason to

stop the real-time reporting where we have the information and where that information will make these prices better for the people that use it.

And this is the same issue with the end users. They're going to get a better deal if we allow this disclosure. Why they're fighting us is beyond me, unless they're in cahoots with the Wall Street banks. I'm not sure. Do people think that the folks on Wall Street aren't making enough money? Is that what this is about? I don't know.

Mr. GARRETT. I would appreciate if the gentleman would not make the allegation that we make these applications here because anyone is in cahoots with Wall Street banks, such as you've just made.

Mr. PETERSON. They are the people that are against this. They were against it when we did it. So I just don't buy that the pension funds are the ones that are concerned about this because the things that they're concerned about are covered in the law, and they're being taken into account by Chairman Gensler and the people at the CFTC as they develop these rules.

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will yield, I know I read through it quickly because I was asked to move along things quickly at the end of the evening, but one of the documents that I read was one of the comment letters. It was not from the Wall Street bank but was from the American Benefits Council, those very same pension benefits companies speaking about this. They are the ones who are raising it. So it is those end users. Those are the participants. Those people are representing beneficiaries. They are the ones who are asking for this delay. It's not the Wall Street banks that I'm making reference to. It's the pension funds.

Mr. PETERSON. There are hundreds of thousands of comments. I haven't read them all. I don't know what they all say.

Mr. GARRETT. We can supply you with the ones.

Mr. PETERSON. Well, I have end users coming into my office arguing against their own interests. So I can't figure it out.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. But all I'm saying is this is an unnecessary amendment. It's in the statute. These things are covered. It makes no sense to delay the entire situation. You have maybe a few things that are of concern, and they are going to be taken care of.

Mr. FARR. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. What Ranking Member PETERSON is talking about is that this is an ag bill that is to help agriculture, producers of agriculture. What this amendment does is hurt them. It supports the banks by delaying transparency. So it's going to cost the end

user more money. The end user is all the customers that this bill is all about.

If the gentleman really wants to help the banks, maybe his amendment ought to be in the Financial Services bill. But this is going to hurt our people that we, in this committee, work for all the time. And I don't think that's a very good amendment.

I ask for a "no" vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 80, after line 2, insert the following (and make such technical and conforming changes as may be appropriate):

SEC. 747. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the value of emphasizing the importance of urban gardening. My amendment would prohibit any of the funds made available by the appropriations from being used in contravention of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.

Forty-seven million American families live in poverty that restricts their access to healthy food. The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 supports numerous programs aimed at reducing hunger throughout the country. Seventeen million children struggle with hunger every day, affecting their ability to learn and develop in a country so full of resources. It is unconscionable that millions of children do not have enough to eat. We cannot consider proposals that would contradict existing legislation aimed at improving food security, such as the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.

In my home State of Texas, where I represent the 18th Congressional District, 17.4 percent of all households struggle with food security. Community Food Projects Competitive Grants are a vital aspect of the Food and Nutrition Act and must be preserved. Community Food Projects Grants have helped thousands of people in low-in-

come communities combat food insecurity by developing community food projects that encourage healthy habits and self-sufficiency. These grants increase the self-reliance of low-income communities that have historically encountered difficulties in providing foods. Programs funded by Community Food Projects Grants have been successful in cities and towns. And, in fact, more than 550,000 Harris County residents relied on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program to buy food.

But one of the important aspects of this is the urban garden. The People's Garden School Pilot Program will develop and run gardens in high-poverty schools. Teaching students about health and nutrition and increasing access to healthy foods are invaluable benefits of schools where more than 50 percent of the student body qualifies for free or reduced-cost lunches.

I rise to encourage support for this particular part of the bill so that we can continue to support urban gardening. And I want to salute Veggie Pals, a gardening program that does just that. It finds patches of land wherever it might be, and it makes sure that we provide healthy food.

This amendment would ensure that nothing in this legislation, nothing in this appropriation would prohibit the growth and continued expansion of this very important concept of urban gardening. The number of Americans who suffer from poverty and hunger is unacceptable.

□ 0010

Reducing or redirecting funding meant to increase food security and nutrition is simply not an option. Join me in recognizing the value of urban gardens. And thank you to the Veggie Pals gardening program that has educated how many thousands of children and emphasized the value of good and healthy food.

This program, Veggie Pals, urban gardening, educating people about nutrition, meal preparation, physical activities, cookbooks, Olympics and others, promotes healthy behavior.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise before you and my colleagues today to take the opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 2112, "Making Appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes." My amendment would prohibit any of the funds made available by the appropriations from being used in contravention of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.

47 million American families live in poverty that restricts their access to healthy food. The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 supports numerous programs aimed at reducing hunger throughout the country.

17 million children struggle with hunger every day, affecting their ability to learn and develop. In a country so full of resources, it is unconscionable that millions of children do not



have enough to eat. We cannot consider proposals that would contradict existing legislation aimed at improving food security, such as the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.

In my home state of Texas, where I represent the 18th Congressional District, 17.4 percent of all households struggle with food security. Community Food Project Competitive Grants are a vital aspect of the Food and Nutrition Act that must be preserved.

Community Food Project grants have helped thousands of people in low-income communities combat food insecurity by developing community food projects that encourage healthy habits and self-sufficiency.

These grants increase the self reliance of low income communities that have historically encountered difficulties in providing for their own food needs. Programs funded by community food project grants have been successful in cities and towns across America, and would certainly make a difference in the 18th Congressional District. In December of 2010, more than 550,000 Harris County residents relied on the Supplemental Nutrition Access Program to buy food.

Hunger and food insecurity have grave impacts on children. Students do not have the opportunity to succeed if they are hungry. The People's Garden School Pilot program will develop and run gardens at high poverty schools. Teaching students about health and nutrition and increasing access to healthy foods are invaluable benefits at schools where more than 50 percent of the student body qualifies for free or reduced cost lunches.

Community food project grants and other initiatives such as the People's Garden Project represent practical and long term solutions to ending food insecurity in America. We must be committed to funding programs that encourage self-sufficient food sources, highlight the importance of nutrition, and reach children at an early age.

The number of Americans who suffer from poverty and hunger is unacceptable. Reducing or redirecting funding meant to increase food security and nutrition is simply not an option. We must continue to fund programs like the community food project grants and the People's Garden.

It is the responsibility of each and every Member in this chamber to work for the well-being of our constituents and to ensure that the basic needs of constituents are met. I urge my colleagues to think of those who are affected by hunger in their districts and support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the Departmental Regulation of the Department of Agriculture entitled "Policy Statement on Climate Change Adaptation" (Departmental Regulation 1070-001 (June 3, 2011)).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prevents any taxpayer funds from being used to implement the Department of Agriculture's new rule and regulation titled Policy Statement on Climate Change Adaptation.

Mr. Chairman, we've had this debate on cap-and-trade in the last Congress. In fact, there was a bipartisan coalition of Members that voted and ultimately defeated the cap-and-trade proposal by President Obama brought in the last Congress. And yet here we now have a new regulation that was just issued by the Department of Agriculture less than 2 weeks ago to implement, in essence, a back-door attempt to put a cap-and-trade program in place in the Department of Agriculture.

And if you'll look at some of the details laid out in this policy statement, this is a regulation that was just implemented by the Department of Agriculture. It gives new powers to the Department to go into areas where right now we, as a Congress, have said we don't want the administration to be going.

In fact, if you'll look at what agencies like the EPA are doing in trying to implement other forms of cap-and-trade, global warming, carbon emission-type programs, we've been rolling those agencies back. We've been having hearings that have showed how this is not only bad policy but this will kill jobs in America.

And so if you look at some of the provisions in this, the policy establishes a USDA-wide directive to integrate climate change adaptation planning into USDA programs, policies, and operations.

Mr. Chairman, it further goes on, it actually gives new powers to the agency. It says every single office shall identify for USDA's Office of the General Counsel areas where legal analysis is needed to carry out actions identified under this Department regulation.

Now, what does that mean? Well, if you just look at what these types of policies and regulations are being used to do at EPA, what it does is give the authority for USDA lawyers to go and issue findings that can then be used against our farmers, findings that will cost our farmers jobs, increase the price of food.

And don't just look at what this policy does. Look at what's happening in some of the other agencies where they're already trying to carry this out, and Congress has been trying to roll them back.

And so at a time when we're broke—42 cents of every dollar we spend is borrowed money—this new regulation creates and references all of these new offices, the Climate Change Program Office. It says they've got to develop a USDA climate change adaptation plan. It references the USDA's global change task force.

In fact, if you look, after they released this new regulation, they issued \$7.4 million to implement a bunch of new grants that are being used to do things like study carbon credits.

Well, again, that was all brought up in cap-and-trade and rejected by Congress. And yet here they come with a de facto, back-door attempt at another cap-and-trade-type of program.

We've got to stop this attack on our job creators. We've got to stop, in this case, the attack that's being proposed on our farmers. They actually are now spending millions of dollars, the USDA is, to study how farmers can grow crops in 2050, based on what they think the climate will be under these new regulations.

Look, our local weatherman can't tell us what the weather's going to be this Saturday, within a 50 percent margin of error. And yet the Department's spending millions of dollars to tell us what the climate's going to be in 39 years to determine how our farmers should be growing crops. This is ludicrous. We rejected it here in Congress. We shouldn't be allowing these kinds of regulations to be implemented. And hopefully this amendment will get adopted.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 80, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932(e)).

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. As I discuss my amendment, I want to indicate to my friends on the other side of the aisle, for the life of me, I can't understand why you would oppose an amendment that costs no funds and only emphasizes the importance of urban gardening. There lies the ludicrousness of



the lack of collaboration and understanding when there are amendments that would help all of us. So I do express my great disappointment that you didn't understand the amendment and, rather than ask what the amendment meant, you voted loudly "no." That's unfortunate for the American people. We do that all the time.

But I rise today to emphasize the importance of making sure that we implement the judgment that has already previously been discussed that helps the unfortunate farmers that experienced proven discrimination at the Department of Agriculture and to credit Members on both sides of the aisle for recognizing it and recognizing the importance of not infringing upon a judicial decision, a settlement that could help a number of farmers in all categories that were acknowledged by many Members of this body.

I thank a number of my colleagues who worked on these issues for a number of years. They worked on it with great sincerity and, as well, they recognized that it is important for us to continue to produce food, but, as well, we need to ensure that all farmers, small farmers and certainly minority farmers, have the opportunity to engage in their trade.

My amendment would ensure that the agricultural appropriations are effectively and promptly made available as necessary through this process and, as well, to work with cooperatives supporting small socially disadvantaged producers.

The amendment would make the allocation of funds to cooperatives supporting the work of minority and socially disadvantaged farmers as provided in section 310(b)(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act a priority.

Again, this particular amendment requires no money. It just indicates that we should follow through on the provisions. However, this funding is vital to support the many farmers and their families that work tirelessly to make sure that other hardworking families have food to eat. It would be hard to deny the vital role that American farmers play in our society.

It is also important that this significant group of American farmers not be overlooked, not be marginalized. And I would, frankly, say that we support their continued existence. They have a long history, and I believe it is important to do so.

As a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, I remember the long journey we took in order to ensure that African American, Latino and Native American farmers would not be shortchanged of grants, loans, and programs. This amendment simply seeks to reinforce that.

Finally, I would make the point that I hope that we would have the opportunity to find the necessary collaboration again to settle claims of discrimination from those farmers who had not yet come under the particular recent

settlement. The President had requested some \$40 million to provide settlements for discrimination claims filed under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.

□ 0020

It is unfortunate that those resources apparently were not able to be included.

The USDA anticipates that 600 claims will need to be settled under this action. The estimate of funding needed to settle these 600 cases is based on the average settlement cost for claimants under other civil rights class action law suits, most notably the already settled Pigford discrimination lawsuit.

This request was only of \$20 million. It is not in this bill. This amendment does not address the fact that it's not in this bill; it simply says we are fair when we understand the issue. I hope that we will have the opportunity to understand the issue. The more farmers we can have producing the good food that has made America great—the bread basket of America—is the better way to go.

So I hope my colleagues will support this amendment that simply reinforces the importance of creating equal access to resources so that we can produce the food necessary for the American people. I showed just a moment ago that of a healthy child and a military family. We need to make sure that all Americans have access to food, and we should extinguish the concept of food insecurity. We can do that by helping the many different farmers and small farmers that rely upon these very important programs to help them produce the food for America.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I rise before you and my colleagues today to take the opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 2112, "Making Appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes." My amendment would ensure that agricultural appropriations are effectively and promptly made available to minority farmers and cooperatives supporting small, socially disadvantaged producers.

This amendment would make the allocation of funds to cooperatives supporting the work of minority and socially disadvantaged farmers as provided in Section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act a priority. I believe by considering cooperative development grants for farmers for the fiscal year 2012, we as a Congressional body have already taken a step in the right direction. This funding is vital to support the many farmers and their families that work tirelessly to make sure that other hardworking American families have food to eat. It would be hard to deny the vital role that American farmers play in our society. The benefits of their labors are immediately visible in our schools' cafeterias, our local grocery stores, and even on our dining room tables. American farmers and farming

programs should be appreciated, supported, and funded.

However, in this significant group of American farmers, it is important that we not overlook the too often marginalized population of minority farmers. As many of you may know, the history of minority farmers and government programs is a long and tumultuous one. Minority farmers have faced years of institutionalized discrimination when applying for Federal Government funding. This is a fact that is discouraging for many minority farmers, and quite frankly embarrassing for many government institutions.

As a Senior Member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have been actively involved in the fight to ensure that minority farmers receive justice for the many discriminations that they have faced and a fair chance at achieving the American Dream. Too often African American, Latino, and Native American farmers have been shortchanged on agricultural grants, loans, and programs. This injustice has prevented minority farmers from being as successful as they could be. It has also prevented American society in general from reaping the benefits of their labor. It is with this very sad-denying fact in mind that I propose the immediate distribution of funding designated for cooperatives whose primary focus is to provide assistance to small, socially disadvantaged producers.

By accelerating the disbursement of this funding, minority farmers and cooperatives supporting minority farmers will have earlier access to the resources that they need and deserve. The results of this funding—technological advances and agricultural sector growth—will benefit not only farmers, but American society as a whole. The benefits will be evident on our local farms, in our neighborhood supermarkets, and in our national economy. If we want our agricultural sector to grow, thrive, and compete, we must consider this amendment to make the distribution of these funds urgent and effective.

The time has come for the United States to take a proactive role in upholding the standards of equality and fairness in the agricultural sector. I believe it is of the utmost importance that we make use of every available opportunity to acknowledge the work of all Americans whose labor contributes to the health and welfare of society. All agricultural workers, minority farmers in particular, should be provided the necessary assistance to ensure that the fruits of their labor can continue to fuel our daily work. This is not just because the government has historically done such a poor job providing equal and fair support to minority farmers, but because it is the right thing to do. With this in mind I urge the adaptation of my proposed amendment to H.R. 2112. Thank you for your time and consideration in this imperative matter.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HIRONO

Ms. HIRONO. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. For preventive measures authorized under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590a et seq.), including research, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, rehabilitation of existing structures, and changes in use of land, there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Agricultural Programs—Agriculture Buildings and Facilities and Rental Payments" is reduced by, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of my amendment to restore \$3 million in funding for the Watershed and Flood Protection program. Funding for this program was eliminated in fiscal year 2011, and no funding is provided in this bill.

My amendment provides \$3 million for this program, just 10 percent of the \$30 million provided in fiscal year 2010. I am taking funding from the agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments to offset the cost of my amendment. Under my amendment, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, NRCS, would make the determination on where to direct the funds.

The Watershed and Flood Control Program provides for cooperation between the Federal Government, States, and localities to prevent erosion, flood water, and sediment damage. This is also a vital program to further the development, utilization, and disposal of water. It also helps to further the conservation and utilization of land and authorized watersheds.

Watershed improvements under this program are cost-shared between the Federal Government and local governments. I think that's a good thing. The program is being zeroed out despite the fact that we have an unfunded Federal commitment of more than \$1 billion for 297 cost-shared projects in 39 States, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. These projects would help to reduce flood damage in 320 communities, improve agriculture water supply in 80 communities, and improve water quality in 132 streams.

Clearly, the national reach of this program is apparent from the numbers I just cited. In fact, I have a list of the 41 States and the Pacific islands that have been helped by this program, including Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas—the list goes on.

States and the local governments have worked together with NRCS, and they put up their own funds to construct flood control and water develop-

ment projects. I don't think it is fair to leave these local governments holding the bag while the Federal Government just walks away from these commitments. Even shutting down projects of course costs money, and we can't leave them just halfway done on these projects. How can we just walk away from these projects before realizing the economic and environmental benefits they were designed to deliver?

I urge my colleagues to support funding for this important program. It affects 40 States plus Pacific islands.

I will submit for the RECORD a list of unfunded Federal commitments to authorized watershed projects in so many of our States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii will be postponed.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY) having assumed the chair, Mr. DOLD, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2112) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest last night on the debate pertaining to cutting funds for children and women with the Department of Agriculture. And I'm greatly disturbed by the assertion that we should do that and cut programs for senior citizens and the disabled because of the budgetary problems that we're having here in Washington.

Yes, we're having problems; but those problems did not start 18 months ago. Those problems have been going on for a very long time. And we're making decisions. And when we voted—not I—in December to give billionaires and millionaires \$780 billion and then in June and April you say you don't have money for pension checks and you don't have money for senior citizens and you don't have money for children and babies, it's a mispriority.

And for people to get on this floor and constantly talk about the recovery and the number of jobs, well, I want to submit just for the record the number of jobs that were saved in Florida and Georgia and other places because of the Recovery Act.

#### HOURLY OF MEETING

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, June 16, 2011, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1963. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Swine Hides and Skins, Bird Trophies, and Ruminant Hides and Skins; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0113] (RIN: 0579-AC11) received May 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1964. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Brucellosis in Swine; Add Texas to List of Validated Brucellosis-Free States [Docket No.: APHIS-2011-0005] received May 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1965. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Annual Report for FY 2010 regarding the training, and its associated expenses, of U.S. Special Operations Forces (SOF) with friendly foreign forces, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2011; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1966. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Evaluation of the TRICARE Program for Fiscal Year 2011, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1073 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1967. A letter from the Secretary, Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding a directed quantity reduction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1968. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Donald C. Wurster, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1969. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John T. Sheridan, United States Air

Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1970. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Lieutenant General William G. Webster, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1971. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on the operations of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for fiscal year 2010, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5302(c)(2); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1972. A letter from the Acting Director, SFHGLD, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program (RIN: 0575-AC83) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1973. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulation Divisions, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — HUD Multifamily Rental Projects: Regulatory Revisions [Docket No.: FR-5393-F-02] (RIN: 2502-A195) received May 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1974. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1975. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Luxembourg pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1976. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Home Loan Bank Investments (RIN: 2590-AA32) received May 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1977. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Corporate Credit Unions (RIN: 3133-AD74) received May 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1978. A letter from the Director, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — General Working Conditions in Shipyard Employment [Docket No.: OSHA-S049-2006-0675 (formerly Docket No. S-049)] (RIN: 1218-AB50) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1979. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2010 report of Health, United States, compiled by the National Center for Health Statistics, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 242m(a)(1)(c); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1980. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 11-22 pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1981. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958, Transmittal No.

6-11 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Czech Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1982. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 702 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 2003 (Pub. L. 107-228), a report on the 2010 U.S.-Vietnam Human Rights Dialogue Meetings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1983. A letter from the Acting Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1984. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, and continued by the President each year, most recently on November 6, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1985. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1986. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1987. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting copy of the report entitled "Comparative Analysis of Actual Cash Collections to the Revised Revenue Estimate Through the 4th Quarter of Fiscal Year 2010", pursuant to D.C. Code section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1988. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1989. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1990. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010, through March 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1991. A letter from the Commissioner, Election Assistance Commission, transmitting Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period October 31, 2010 through March 1, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1992. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's semiannual report from

the Office of the Inspector General during the 6-month period ending March 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1993. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Report on Final Action Resulting from Audit Reports, Inspection Reports, and Evaluation Reports for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1994. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1995. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Alabama Regulatory Program [SATS No.: AL-076-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2010-0020] received May 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1996. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Montana Regulatory Program [STAS No.: MT-030-FOR; Docket ID No. OSM-2009-0007] received May 23, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1997. A letter from the Assistant Secretary — Land and Materials Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Renewable Energy Alternate Uses of Existing Facilities on the Outer Continental Shelf-Acquire a Lease Noncompetitively [Docket ID: BOEM-2010-0045] (RIN: 1010-AD71) received 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1998. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; 2011 Sector Operations Plans and Contracts, and Allocation of Northeast Multispecies Annual Catch Entitlements [Docket No.: 110201085-1212-02] (RIN: 0648-XY55) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1999. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 45 [Docket No.: 100923469-1211-02] (RIN: 0648-BA27) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2000. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA404) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2001. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish

Fishery; 2011 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications; Regulatory Amendment [Docket No.: 101228634-1149-02] (RIN: 0648-BA26) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2002. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA364) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2003. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Groupers Fishery of the South Atlantic; Reopening of the Commercial Sector for Vermilion Snapper in the South Atlantic [Docket No.: 040205043-4043-01] (RIN: 0648-XA360) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2004. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 101029427-0609-02] (RIN: 0648-XA371) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2005. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Fishery; 2011 Accountability Measures for Greater Amberjack and Closure of the 2011 Gulf of Mexico Commercial Sector for Greater Amberjack [Docket Nos.: 100610255-0257-01 and 040205043-4043-01] (RIN: 0648-XA353) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2006. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA405) received May 16, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2007. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Requiring Residents Who Live Outside the United States To File Petitions According to Form Instructions [CIS No.: 2502-11, DHS Docket No. USCIS-2011-0002] (RIN: 1615-AB93) received May 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2008. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's decision not to petition the Supreme court to review the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in the case United States v. Warshak, 631 F.3d 266 (6th Cir. 2010); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2009. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting copy of the Office of Victims of Crime (OVC) International Terrorism Victim Ex-

pense Reimbursement (ITVERP) Report to Congress 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2010. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Federal Aviation Administration's Capital Investment Plan (CIP) for fiscal years 2012-2016, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2011. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Sundstrand Propellers Model 247F Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0113; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-25-AD; Amendment 39-16602; AD 2011-04-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2012. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault-Aviation Model FALCON 7X Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1207; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-140-AD; Amendment 39-16680; AD 2011-09-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2013. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A340-200, -300, -500, and -600 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0386; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-115-AD; Amendment 39-16679; AD 2011-09-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2014. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DG Flugzeugbau GmbH Glaser-Dirks Model DG-808C Gliders [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0409; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-011-AD; Amendment 39-16678; AD 2011-09-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2015. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330-300, A340-200, and A340-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1309; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-060-AD; Amendment 39-16662; AD 2011-08-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2016. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model DC-9-14, DC-9-15, and DC-9-15F, Airplanes; and DC-9-20, DC-9-30, DC-9-40, and DC-9-50 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0958; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-188-AD; Amendment 39-16641; AD 2011-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2017. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 400) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0436; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-230-AD; Amendment 39-16643; AD 2011-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2018. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness

Directives; Reims Aviation S.A. Model F406 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0058; Directorate Identifier 2010-CE-071-AD; Amendment 39-16640; AD 2011-07-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2019. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikma Aero Seat 9140, 9166, 9173, 9174, 9184, 9188, 9196, 91B7, 91B8, 91C0, 91C2, 91C4, 91C5, and 9301 Series Passenger Seat Assemblies; and Sikma Aero Seat 9501311-05, 9501301-06, 9501311-15, 9501301-16, 9501441-30, 9501441-33, 9501311-55, 9501301-56, 9501441-83, 9501441-95, 9501311-97, and 9501301-98 Passenger Seat Assemblies; Installed on Various Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0027; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-204-AD; Amendment 39-16642; AD 2011-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2020. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Fifteenth 2011 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program, pursuant to Public Law 104-193, section 231 (110 Stat. 2197); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2021. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

2022. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Self-Certification and Employee Training of Mail-Order Distributors of Scheduled Listed Chemical Products [Docket No.: DEA-3471] (RIN: 1117-AB30) received May 5, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

2023. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H.R. 2182. A bill to provide incentives for the development of qualified infectious disease products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. RIVERA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 2183. A bill to increase the portion of community development block grants that may be used to provide public services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 2184. A bill to establish the Rare Earth Policy Task Force, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to develop a plan to ensure the long-term supply of rare earth materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition

to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2185. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reaffirm the United States' historic commitment to protecting refugees who are fleeing persecution or torture; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2186. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the security of the United States and the readiness of the Armed Forces by increasing diversity within the leadership ranks of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. STARK, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 2187. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 2188. A bill to require government-wide application of continuous process improvement methods to reduce waste and improve the effectiveness of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2189. A bill to encourage States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding the deaths of individuals in the custody of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STARK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 2190. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require drug manufacturers to provide drug rebates for drugs dispensed to low-income individuals under the Medicare prescription drug benefit program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CARSON

of Indiana, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLEAV-ER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 2191. A bill to require that any home inspection conducted in connection with a purchase of residential real property that involves a federally related mortgage loan be conducted by a State-licensed or State-certified home inspector to determine the existence of structural, mechanical, and electrical safety defects, and to require inclusion in the standard settlement statement of information regarding any home inspection conducted in connection with settlement; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 2192. A bill to exempt for an additional 4-year period, from the application of the means-test presumption of abuse under chapter 7, qualifying members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and members of the National Guard who, after September 11, 2001, are called to active duty or to perform a homeland defense activity for not less than 90 days; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 2193. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to ensure funding for grants to promote responsible fatherhood and strengthen low-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 2194. A bill to provide grants to better understand and reduce gestational diabetes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. BALDWIN):

H.R. 2195. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home infusion therapy under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2196. A bill to direct President, utilizing the Western Area Power Administration, to acquire renewable energy in amounts sufficient to ensure that, of the total amount of electric energy the Federal Government consumes during any fiscal year, certain minimum amounts shall be renewable energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON,

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 2197. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide incentives to States and units of local government under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program for providing certain services to victims of sexual assault or rape, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana):

H.R. 2198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the alternative tax liability limitation for small property and casualty insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H.R. 2199. A bill to prohibit the issuance of certain visas to nationals of a country that denies or unreasonably delays the repatriation of a national ordered removed from the United States to such country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 2200. A bill to limit assistance to Honduras unless the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Honduras has settled all outstanding expropriation claims brought by United States companies against the Government of Honduras; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2201. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the provision of items and services provided to Medicare beneficiaries residing in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 2202. A bill to reauthorize the Essex National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2203. A bill to establish a pilot program under which veterans in the State of Alaska may receive health care benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs at non-Department medical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. BER-

MAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BACA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NUNES, Ms. CHU, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. SPIER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CARDOZA, and Mr. DOLD):

H. Res. 306. A resolution urging the Republic of Turkey to safeguard its Christian heritage and to return confiscated church properties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H. Res. 307. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish a Committee on the Reduction of

Nonessential Federal Expenditures; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

H. Res. 308. A resolution recognizing the achievements of America's high school valedictorians of the graduating class of 2011, promoting the importance of encouraging intellectual growth, and rewarding academic excellence of all American high school students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia:

H.R. 2182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in article I, section 8, clause 18 granting Congress the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I—The Legislative Branch.

Section 1: The Legislature:

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 8:

Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Clause 18. The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado:

H.R. 2184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authorities on which this bill rests is:

The power of Congress to make law regarding the needful rules and regulations respecting the property of the United States, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 2185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2186.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, 14 and 18.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 2187.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clause 1), which grants Congress the power to provide for the "general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 2188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, under which Congress has the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 2189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 2190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause (Art. I & 8, cl. 3) of the United States Constitution provide that the Congress shall have the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Authorization Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 2195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 2196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 1 and 18.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 2198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 clause 1.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization and Clause I of Section 8 or Article I which states that Congress has the power to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 2200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 2201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 14.

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 2202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 91: Mr. WOLF, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. BENISHEK.  
H.R. 136: Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 177: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GALLEGLY.  
H.R. 178: Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 198: Mr. ALTMIRE.  
H.R. 303: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 374: Mr. HULTGREN.  
H.R. 440: Mr. CARTER.  
H.R. 452: Mr. REHBERG.  
H.R. 457: Mr. LANDRY.  
H.R. 469: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. MORAN.  
H.R. 494: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
H.R. 498: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.  
H.R. 529: Mr. LYNCH.  
H.R. 583: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SIREY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. LANGEVIN.  
H.R. 605: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HURT, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. STUTZMAN.  
H.R. 640: Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 674: Mr. LATTA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. FLORES.  
H.R. 679: Mr. WOLF.  
H.R. 708: Mr. BARLETTA.  
H.R. 711: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
H.R. 721: Mr. DENT, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. SEWELL.  
H.R. 733: Mr. FILNER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. RAHALL.  
H.R. 735: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. HECK, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.



H.R. 771: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. POE of Texas.  
 H.R. 776: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 795: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
 H.R. 799: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 816: Mr. BOUSTANY.  
 H.R. 822: Mr. MCKEON and Ms. BUERKLE.  
 H.R. 854: Mr. KISSELL.  
 H.R. 870: Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 886: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. PAULSEN.  
 H.R. 931: Mr. BENISHEK.  
 H.R. 942: Mr. McDERMOTT.  
 H.R. 964: Mr. OLVER.  
 H.R. 972: Mr. HERGER and Mr. WEST.  
 H.R. 997: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. PALAZZO.  
 H.R. 999: Mr. HIGGINS.  
 H.R. 1006: Mr. CANSECO.  
 H.R. 1028: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 1047: Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.  
 H.R. 1057: Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 1063: Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 1075: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 1080: Mr. CAPUANO.  
 H.R. 1116: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 1166: Mr. HERGER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.  
 H.R. 1173: Mr. ALEXANDER and Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 1174: Mr. BERMAN.  
 H.R. 1188: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
 H.R. 1192: Mr. MCKEON.  
 H.R. 1195: Mr. LUJÁN and Mr. TIBERI.  
 H.R. 1200: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. CHU.  
 H.R. 1208: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1234: Ms. MOORE.  
 H.R. 1236: Mr. QUIGLEY Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.  
 H.R. 1242: Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 1259: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. CAMPBELL.  
 H.R. 1265: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 H.R. 1311: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
 H.R. 1350: Mr. McDERMOTT.  
 H.R. 1354: Mr. MICHAUD.  
 H.R. 1386: Mr. KISSELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. BERKLEY.  
 H.R. 1391: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. LANDRY.  
 H.R. 1397: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 1416: Mr. LONG and Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.R. 1418: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 1449: Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 1456: Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 1477: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 1489: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.  
 H.R. 1509: Mr. BRADY of Texas.  
 H.R. 1515: Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. SEWELL.  
 H.R. 1545: Mr. BURGESS.  
 H.R. 1546: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. BURGESS.  
 H.R. 1565: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas and Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 1571: Mr. ROONEY.  
 H.R. 1585: Mr. BOREN and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.  
 H.R. 1588: Mr. SCHILLING.  
 H.R. 1614: Mr. McDERMOTT.  
 H.R. 1623: Mr. RUSH and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 1635: Mr. CASSIDY.  
 H.R. 1681: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 1703: Mr. KUCINICH.  
 H.R. 1723: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WEST, and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.  
 H.R. 1735: Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 1744: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. LONG.  
 H.R. 1755: Mr. MARINO and Mr. COSTELLO.  
 H.R. 1756: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 1789: Mr. SHERMAN.  
 H.R. 1798: Mr. REED.  
 H.R. 1815: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 1821: Ms. NORTON and Ms. MOORE.  
 H.R. 1833: Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 1842: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WU, and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 1848: Mr. COBLE.  
 H.R. 1856: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SHULER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. HONDA.  
 H.R. 1861: Mr. ALTMIRE.  
 H.R. 1885: Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
 H.R. 1901: Mr. DINGELL.  
 H.R. 1912: Mr. DINGELL.  
 H.R. 1913: Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 1932: Mr. WOODALL.  
 H.R. 1940: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
 H.R. 1948: Mr. LATHAM.  
 H.R. 1955: Mrs. LOWEY.  
 H.R. 1968: Ms. CHU.  
 H.R. 1981: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H.R. 1996: Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LABRADOR, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. MCKEON.  
 H.R. 2010: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. KLINE.  
 H.R. 2018: Mr. LONG and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.  
 H.R. 2032: Mr. STARK, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BURGESS.  
 H.R. 2054: Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 H.R. 2088: Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. BALDWIN.  
 H.R. 2099: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
 H.R. 2102: Mr. MCNERNEY.  
 H.R. 2104: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
 H.R. 2107: Mr. FARR.  
 H.R. 2108: Mr. MARCHANT.  
 H.R. 2111: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY.  
 H.R. 2123: Mr. GERLACH.  
 H.R. 2152: Mr. KEATING, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 2167: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. MCHENRY.  
 H.J. Res. 47: Mrs. MALONEY.  
 H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. GOHMERT.  
 H. Res. 60: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 91: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H. Res. 137: Mr. SCHOCK.  
 H. Res. 227: Mr. KILDEE.  
 H. Res. 234: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 268: Mr. BACA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MARINO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.  
 H. Res. 277: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H. Res. 283: Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H. Res. 289: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Ms. WATERS.  
 H. Res. 290: Ms. BORDALLO and Ms. DEGETTE.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. ENGEL

AMENDMENT No. 34: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:  
 SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, or any other Federal Agency receiving funds under this Act to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 35: Page 49, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 80, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. GOSAR

AMENDMENT No. 36: Page 32, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 35, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$100,000,000)”.

Page 49, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$200,000,000)”.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. LANDRY

AMENDMENT No. 37: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of an individual appointed during a recess of the Senate to fill a vacancy in an office required by law to be filled by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

H.R. 2112

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLDEN

AMENDMENT No. 38: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 5.88 percent and may not be used to carry out the limitations contained in paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 728.